

PROPOSED FAIR-TRADE LEGISLATION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 97, to protect trade-mark owners, distributors, and the public against injurious and uneconomic practices in the distribution of articles of standard quality under a distinguishing trade-mark, brand, or name.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, yesterday I listened with great interest to what the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] said about the bill which is the subject of the pending motion.

On page 827 of the RECORD I find a quotation made by the Senator from Mr. Justice Brandeis. The language used is:

Justice Louis Brandeis, of the United States Supreme Court, when a member of the Massachusetts bar, made the following significant statement as to the general policy of predatory price cutting:

Then follows the quotation:

Americans should be under no illusions as to the value or effect of price cutting. It has been the most potent weapon of monopoly—a means of killing the small rival to which the great trusts have resorted most frequently.

It is so simple, so effective. Far-seeing, organized capital secures by this means the cooperation of the short-sighted, unorganized consumer to his own undoing. Thoughtless or weak, he yields to the temptation of trifling, immediate gain, and, selling his birth-right for a mess of pottage, becomes himself an instrument of monopoly.

That is a quotation made by the Senator from Kansas from Mr. Justice Brandeis when he was a member of the Massachusetts bar, and not upon the Supreme Court.

A colloquy occurred between the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and it is regarding that that I wish to speak. In the colloquy the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]—I am sorry he is not here—called attention to this statement of the Senator from Nebraska, saying—and I quote the language of the Senator from Kentucky, as found on page 827—

It ought to be stated, in fairness to Justice Brandeis, that in issuing that statement he was not issuing it as a judge of the court, but as the employed attorney for the parties interested in this legislation.

Mr. President, in fairness to Mr. Justice Brandeis I think the facts ought to be correctly recorded.

As a matter of fact, by reference to the hearings held on May 30 and June 1, 1916, before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives on H. R. 13568, I find this language; and it shows that the Senator from Kentucky, I think, was mistaken in his recollection of the circumstances at the time.

On page 215, after Mr. Brandeis had testified, the chairman of the committee, Mr. Adamson, said:

You are not here solely in behalf of the ultimate consumers, are you?

Mr. BRANDEIS. I am here in behalf of the public; and I conceive that the public includes all of these classes of people, including Members of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, they need protection.

Mr. BARKLEY, who was then in the House, said—

I am not certain that the public looks upon it in that light.

Mr. BRANDEIS. I think they do.

Mr. BARKLEY. I mean in reference to Members of Congress.

Mr. DECKER. I have no desire to be personal, but we have asked the same questions of everybody here so we can get at the facts. I do not care whom you represent. If you are right I am for you, but sometimes it gives us an idea what is back of these things. I have been getting these circular letters about this Stevens bill. Who is back of this? Whom do you represent?

Mr. BRANDEIS. I represent myself—nobody else.

Mr. DECKER. Nobody else?

The CHAIRMAN. I was not more polite than Mr. Decker, but I knew you better than he did, therefore I put my question more adroitly; I did not ask you whom you represented, but who would be the beneficiary of this legislation.

Mr. BRANDEIS. Let me put it in another way.

Mr. DECKER. It is all right with me if you represent Morgan or not, or anybody else.

Mr. BRANDEIS. Unfortunately, I represent only myself.

Mr. President, I thought that the inference left by the colloquy yesterday was an unpleasant one; and if we may

depend upon the hearing from which I have quoted, Mr. Brandeis, then a member of the bar, said he was here representing himself, and not, as stated by the Senator from Kentucky, that he was "the employed attorney for the parties interested in this legislation."

While I am on my feet I want to say a word more.

A very interesting meeting of the Trade Committee Conference of the National Association of Manufacturers was held in New York on October 23, 1928.

At that time Mr. William J. Baxter, director of the Chain Stores Research Bureau, New York, and an expert on chain store management, said certain things which I should like to have in the RECORD. He referred to the fact that he had been associated with about 300 different chain-store organizations in their development, and, among other things, Mr. Baxter said:

To me there isn't any question as to the advisability of any retail store, if it can, to sell some nationally known product at cost to get the crowd. * * * A consumer will go to a grocery store and she is willing to pay 55 cents for a steak, whereas it might be sold for 52 or 50 cents elsewhere, if she at the same time can purchase Campbell's soup or some other package goods at cost. * * * Scientific retailing means studying the "blind" articles in the store and selling them at full prices. But what we call "open" articles, the ones that the consumer can go from store to store and compare, selling them at low prices.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President—

Mr. COPELAND. Just one moment. I have no desire to continue the discussion, but I do want the RECORD to show that there are many very serious-minded persons, representing nobody but themselves and their own intelligence and the public, who believe that there is an evil here which should be dealt with effectively. Whether or not the Capper-Kelly bill can do that, or can not do it, I am not prepared to say; but I did want Mr. Brandeis to be properly represented regarding the statements he made in the hearing in 1916.

Mr. WATSON obtained the floor.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. WATSON. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. I understand the Senator from Indiana intends to move for an adjournment until to-morrow.

Mr. WATSON. I do.

PERMISSIBLE ALCOHOLIC CONTENT OF BEER, ALE, OR PORTER

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, to-morrow, as soon as may be in order, I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 2473) to provide for increasing the permissible alcoholic content of beer, ale, or porter to 3.2 per cent by weight, and to provide means by which all such beer, ale, or porter shall be made of products of American farms. I shall then offer an amendment to substitute for that bill the language of the bill passed by the House of Representatives yesterday, which was messaged to the Senate to-day.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, that a quorum is not present is apparent, and I am satisfied that so many Senators have left the city and are not accessible that it would be difficult to get a quorum. Therefore I move that the Senate adjourn until to-morrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, December 23, 1932, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 22, 1932

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we rejoice because of that hour when Almighty God came out of a world grown weary and gray and made Himself vocal in the heavenly anthem by the overhanging hosts—"Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good will toward men." Oh, what a thrilling moment

it was when that angel song first beat on the hills of time. His name is clothed with immortal remembrance, to which the generations of men have come to light their torches of undying hope. We would thus come with our prayers and dreams to the manger altar and pay our homage to Him who walks the highways of the ages. Holy Savior, as we come, may we forget the forced marches, the smiting aches, and any unbrotherly relations, and devoutly remember the One who has passed this way, manifesting love, mercy, and abundance for all. We pray that His spirit of brotherhood and good will may roll forward over the Republic like a golden river. Let it rule in triumph over street, market place, and home, clothed with beauty, love, and sympathy, opening the gates of a new life as it touches the hearthstones of our land. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4972. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Georgia to construct, maintain, and operate a highway bridge across the Savannah River near Lincolnton, Ga., and between Lincolnton, Ga., and McCormick, S. C.;

S. 5059. An act to extend the time for completion of a bridge across Lake Champlain at or near Rouses Point, N. Y., and a point at or near Alburgh, Vt.;

S. 5148. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust debts owing the United States for feed, fuel, and crop-production loans;

S. 5183. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Board of County Commissioners of Allegheny County, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Monongahela River between the city of Pittsburgh and the borough of Homestead, Pa.; and

S. J. Res. 220. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to sell obsolete and surplus clothing at nominal prices for distribution to the needy.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. ODDIE and Mr. McKELLAR members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Post Office Department.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7233) entitled "An act to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, to provide for the independence of the same, and for other purposes."

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BUCHANAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 13872, Rept. No. 1807) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I am advised that the committee expects to get through with the Interior Department appropriation bill to-day; and if we get through to-day, it will not be necessary for Members to come back to-morrow. To-morrow we want to recess until next Tuesday, and I offer a resolution, which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 333

Resolved, That when the House adjourns on Friday, December 23, 1932, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian Tuesday, December 27, 1932.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman explain it as carefully as possible so that the Members may know just what the program will be for the next week or 10 days?

Mr. RAINEY. The program for next week will be the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

Mr. SNELL. I have been informed that there are several important matters in the Agriculture Department appropriation bill, and one Member told me if that was taken up next week he will insist upon having a quorum present.

Mr. RAINEY. Well, general debate will consume considerable time, I have no doubt.

Mr. SNELL. If it is understood that there will be only general debate, that would not make any difference.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRNS. I hope the gentleman will not take two or three days on general debate on that bill.

Mr. SNELL. If there is something that is not controversial, it will not be necessary for the Members to come back.

Mr. BYRNS. I hope the gentleman will not say that it is not necessary for the Members to be here Tuesday, because I want to call attention to the fact that we ought to pass these appropriation bills and get them to the Senate just as quickly as we can.

Mr. RAINEY. I have not said that.

Mr. BYRNS. I understand the gentleman has not.

Mr. SNELL. As far as I am concerned personally, it does not make any difference, because I do not go out of the city, anyway, but I think we ought to have an understanding whether there is to be important business taken up next week. I would also like to ask if it is intended to call up the conference report on the Philippine bill?

Mr. RAINEY. We might call that up to-day if we finish the Interior Department appropriation bill.

Mr. SNELL. Has it been reported in the House yet? The conference report has not yet been reported, has it?

Mr. RAINEY. I do not know. If it has not, of course, we can not take it up.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. RAINEY. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. What provision is contained in the bill reported to the House to-day for the continuance of Federal aid to roads?

Mr. RAINEY. I do not know.

Mr. TARVER. Has that been eliminated in accordance with the presidential recommendation, or is it contained in the bill?

Mr. RAINEY. Perhaps the gentleman from Texas, chairman of the subcommittee, can explain that.

Mr. BUCHANAN. There is no authorization for 1934. This House must pass an authorization bill, if any appropriation is made.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. I yield.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman give the House the assurance at least that the conference report on the Philippine bill will not be called up in the days intervening between Christmas and the new year? There are a great many Members who are keenly interested in that.

Mr. RAINEY. I could not give that assurance, but perhaps some member of the committee might.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I think that assurance would allay a great many fears on the part of many Members who have made other plans.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Can the gentleman assure the House that there will be no questions involving the Constitution, or no liquor bills brought up next week?

Mr. RAINEY. I can assure the gentleman of that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can not the majority leader consult with the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs and perhaps give some assurance later in the day that the Philippine bill will not be considered until after the first of the year?

Mr. RAINEY. I will be glad to do that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in view of the insistence that the membership of the House, or at least a part of it, shall be kept here during the holidays and the apparent belief that it will not be necessary for but very few to remain, I would like to know just how many Members are participating in this decision to have only a 3-day recess? I therefore make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

Mr. BLANTON. That would not get a vote on the resolution.

Mr. TARVER. I do not want a vote on the resolution. I want to find out how many Members are still here as an indication of how many will be here next week to transact the Nation's business. [Applause.]

Mr. RAINEY. I hope the gentleman will not insist upon the point of order, because that will only delay matters to-day.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman insist upon his point of order?

Mr. TARVER. I do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 133]

Abernethy	Douglass, Mass.	Jones	Reid, Ill.
Aldrich	Doutrich	Kading	Rich
Amie	Drane	Kelly, Ill.	Rogers, N. H.
Andrews, N. Y.	Drewry	Kendall	Rudd
Auf der Heide	Eslick	Kennedy, Md.	Sabath
Baldrige	Fishburne	Kennedy, N. Y.	Sanders, N. Y.
Beam	Fitzpatrick	Kleberg	Schuetz
Beck	Flannagan	Kniffin	Shannon
Bloom	Foss	Kopp	Shott
Bohn	Free	Kunz	Sirovich
Brand, Ga.	Freeman	Lambeth	Smith, Idaho
Brand, Ohio	Fulbright	Larrabee	Smith, Va.
Britten	Fuller	Larsen	Smith, W. Va.
Browning	Gibson	Lehbach	Stafford
Bulwinkle	Gifford	Lewis	Steagall
Butler	Gilbert	Lichtenwalner	Stevenson
Campbell, Pa.	Gillen	Lindsay	Stokes
Canfield	Golder	McGugin	Strong, Pa.
Cannon	Goldsborough	McMillan	Sullivan, N. Y.
Carley	Goodwin	Major	Sullivan, Pa.
Carter, Wyo.	Grandfield	Maloney	Sweeney
Cartwright	Griswold	Martin, Mass.	Tierney
Celler	Hall, Miss.	Martin, Oreg.	Underwood
Chavez	Hancock, N. C.	May	Vinson, Ky.
Christgau	Hart	Mead	Weaver
Christopherson	Hess	Mobley	Whitley
Cole, Md.	Hogg, Ind.	Nelson, Mo.	Williams, Tex.
Connery	Hollister	Oliver, N. Y.	Wingo
Cooke	Hopkins	Overton	Withrow
Corning	Hornor	Owen	Wolfcott
Crall	Horr	Palmisano	Wolfenden
Crosser	Houston	Partridge	Wood, Ga.
Crump	Hull, William E.	Patman	Wood, Ind.
Curry	Igoe	Peavey	Yates
Davenport	Jeffers	Purnell	Yon
Davis, Pa.	Johnson, Ill.	Ragon	
Dominick	Johnson, S. Dak.	Rankin	
Doughton	Johnson, Wash.	Reed, N. Y.	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and seventy-nine Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

CHRISTMAS RECESS

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY]?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know if this is a privileged resolution?

The SPEAKER. It is not.

Mr. SNELL. Then unanimous consent is necessary for its consideration?

The SPEAKER. It is. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

WILLIAM EDWARD CLEARY

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record in tribute to a former colleague of ours, the Hon. William Edward Cleary, who died on Tuesday and who is being buried to-day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, in this very hour the mortal remains of our late colleague the Hon. William Edward Cleary are receiving the last of all earthly honors at the Holy Cross Cemetery in Brooklyn, New York City. While his family and friends are paying this token of respect to his memory, I submit it is fitting and proper that we in this House, which he adorned as a valuable Member for so many years, should make some note of his passing.

The older Members of the House will recall his genial presence, his wise counsel, and his persistent attention to his duties. He became a Member of this honorable body during the Sixty-fifth, or War, Congress. There was a bond of sympathy between us, because he and I, as well as the Hon. JOHN J. DELANEY and the Hon. Jerome F. Donovan, were elected at the same time at the special election held on March 5, 1918.

From the time that he was sworn in until the close of his congressional career on March 4, 1927, there were few men who gave more assiduous and devoted attention to their duties.

Never a session opened without finding him in his seat, a careful listener to the debates, in which he participated at rare but timely intervals; and on every such occasion when he was prompted to take the floor, his words were distinguished for their pertinency and wisdom. This was particularly so in matters which concerned rivers and harbors. He served on the important committee which had those subjects under its jurisdiction and, as he had spent his life in the lighterage and boat industry, his advice was sought and much relied upon by his colleagues.

Mr. Cleary was a man of broad and liberal views—a self-made man in every sense of the term, since he had to earn his living from a very early age. He knew human nature and had a store of practical wisdom which was the fruit of his early struggles and contacts with his fellow men. Temperate in his habits, he had a tolerance for the weaknesses of others. He was well grounded in the principles of Jeffersonian Democracy, and a profound believer in the maxim that that government is best which governs least. He had no patience with Federal interference with State rights. He had an aversion to the eighteenth amendment, viewing it as an attempt to coerce the States and their citizenship into a policy of enforced total abstinence. Consequently and quite naturally he was opposed to the Volstead Act, and when President Wilson's veto came unexpectedly to the House on Monday, October 28, 1919, and a vote was forced despite a gentlemen's agreement to postpone the issue until the following Thursday, his vote was recorded to sustain the President's veto. He was always very proud of this vote, and it is to be regretted that he died on the very eve of the passage of the first bill intended to mitigate some of the evils of prohibition fanaticism.

Having entered politics late in life, after he had acquired a comfortable competency, Mr. Cleary was not hampered in the performance of his congressional duties by the necessity of dividing his time with his personal affairs. All that he had of time and experience he was able to devote, and did devote wholeheartedly, to public business, and when he

voluntarily laid down the honor of representing his constituency in this House the country lost one of its most valuable public servants.

FARM-LAND SECURITIES AS THE BASIS FOR CURRENCY

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, never before since the beginning of our Government has there been such universal desire to help the farmer; and yet I very much fear nothing will be done at this session to anything like solve the problems of agriculture. I am praying and the country is praying for something to be done for the farmers at the earliest possible moment. And, by the farmers I mean the small individual farmers who now own their farms or who did own them at the beginning of this depression or who hope in the future to acquire a farm for home purposes.

I am opposed to all suggestions of chain farming or farming on a large scale by large corporations or monopolies. I feel that the very life not only of our farmers but of the Nation is in the balance.

If we are to save agriculture, the time is here for the immediate application of the most heroic remedy in sight. First, we want to stop loan foreclosures and undo the wrongs already done by them and then, of course, at the earliest possible moment, put into effect some real farm-relief measures, giving relief from taxes and bringing about a permanent scale of much better prices for farm products.

My views on the farmers' tax and marketing problems are well known and I do not wish to further elaborate them now. I do, though, at this time wish to further discuss the awful farm-loan-foreclosure menace. To my mind, passive acquiescence of Congress in the present orgy of farm-loan foreclosures is inexcusable, and if continued will constitute one of the blackest pages of legislative history ever written by any free people.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to my other suggestions and observations in this connection I am proposing that the United States Treasury be authorized and required to accept farm-loan deeds or other loan papers constituting first liens on farm property securing indebtedness to the United States of America to the amount of 80 per cent of the present reasonable value of said property, due 30 years from date, and issue in exchange for said liens the full amount thereof in currency in the form of Treasury certificates to be used as a circulating medium throughout the country and to be redeemable upon demand in 30-year Government bonds drawing 2 per cent annual interest.

These first-lien farm securities would constitute the basis and security for the issuance of the currency; and, of course, as the currency was redeemed, the security for the redeemed currency would become the security for the bonds issued for the redemption.

I am to-day introducing a bill to carry into effect the plan just mentioned by me.

Anyone can see what would be the immediate effect of the enactment of my bill. This would provide a method for the refinancing of farm loans in a way to write off a large part of the loan, extend the balance—not written off—for 30 years without the payment of any interest or any accumulating for 10 or more years.

So far as the farmer is concerned at present, his loan would be paid up in full, except he would not be able to file a lien and receive the equivalent in currency unless he paid off all or a part of the lien against his land. Of course, at the end of 30 years this process could be repeated, or if land had increased in value, more money could be issued on the same land.

After times get better the farmer might be required to pay in, say, 2 per cent interest annually to be placed with his land papers as additional security for the issuance of his currency. This is a matter of detail. Of course, this plan provides for the farmer owning his farm and getting its value in money at the same time. Is not this just what we do for

the banks when we let them still own their gold, bonds, and other securities on deposit in the Treasury as the basis or security for currency issued by the banks?

I would provide that from time to time the farmer could take up, in whole or in part, the securities or bonds outstanding against his land. This plan would cause the farmers to deflate or inflate the currency as their necessities might demand.

Of course, this plan would at once make long-term farm-loan papers very liquid. It would also relieve and greatly help the farmers and all those now holding long-term farm-loan mortgages and loan deeds.

I very much desire that most careful attention be given to perfecting my bill, to the end that this plan prevent the amassing of very large tracts of land to be used in chain farming, but, on the contrary, bring about, perfect, and perpetuate a Nation of individual, independent, happy, and prosperous farmers.

I am convinced that my plan will expand the currency, put an ample abundance of money in circulation, absolutely stop farm-mortgage foreclosures, bring about a most splendid reduction and refinancing of farm indebtedness, and at once be another step toward putting the farmer on an equal footing with industry.

I know my plan is in the rough and that there are many details to be worked out; but why can not this great big rough suggestion be shaped into a wonderful piece of legislation for our farmers and for all our people?

SALE OF OBSOLETE AND SURPLUS CLOTHING OF THE NAVY

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement. The Chair's attention has been called to a joint resolution providing for the sale of obsolete and surplus clothing of the Navy to the Red Cross. This resolution comes from the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, and the Chair is advised that this committee has unanimously recommended the passage of the resolution with an amendment.

The Chair is going to take the responsibility of recognizing the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] to ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution No. 500.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Joint Resolution 500

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to sell, at nominal prices, to recognized charitable organizations, to States and subdivisions thereof, and to municipalities, such nonregulation and excess clothing as may be available and required for distribution to the needy.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma: At the end of the resolution as just read insert: "Provided, That such clothing shall be sold only after agreement by the purchaser that it shall not be resold but shall be given absolutely free to the needy: *Provided further,* That a fair proportionate allotment of such clothing shall be set aside for distribution in each State and the District of Columbia as provided herein and shall not be sold for distribution within any other State until after the expiration of 30 days."

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not know that there will be any objection, but I think the gentleman should make an explanation of what this resolution does.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Will the gentleman accept an amendment making this resolution applicable to the Territories as well as the States and the District of Columbia?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Yes, sir.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. In just a minute I will direct my remarks to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, the Navy Department advises the committee that they have on hand a number of different articles of clothing that are obsolete to the extent that they will not be used. Included in this list are overcoats, shoes, shirts, and a number of articles that could be used to great advantage by the different charitable organizations.

It is proposed to allow these articles to be sold at about 10 per cent of their original cost, with the understanding that such articles are to be distributed without cost to poor people, and the object of the amendment was to make certain that every State in the Union would have an allotment based upon population, and that this amount allotted to the various States would be reserved for a period of 30 days, so that if any State did not desire to use its allotment it then could be disposed of to charitable organizations that were in need of the same.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The allocation or the allotment to the States is limited to the clothing, and once an organization buys that clothing in a certain State it can use all of that clothing within its own State or city?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. It can.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is clear.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. That is clear.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. This is virtually a gratuity. The 10 per cent will probably prevent some communities from getting any of it, hence the gentleman should explain why it could not be made an absolute gratuity.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will permit, take, for instance, shoes that cost \$3.50. The estimated price that a charitable organization will have to pay would be only 25 cents a pair. With respect to overcoats that cost \$10 or \$12, the estimated price that a charitable organization will have to pay, as I understand, is either \$1 or less. I think the maximum cost of underwear is only 10 cents per garment. The charge is very small, and it is very probable that the Navy Department had in mind there would be some cost in packing and making necessary plans for the shipment of this clothing. So the cost amounts to hardly anything in comparison with the good that will be accomplished.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to have a full explanation about this matter. I would like to ask a question or two myself about it. There is no hurry, anyway.

Mr. SPARKS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SPARKS. Will the gentleman tell the Members of the House about how much surplus clothing there will be available under this resolution?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The list was put in the record of the hearings this morning; it will also be found in the Senate RECORD of yesterday, on page 825; and as I recall, there are about 84,000 overcoats, about 60,000 pairs of shoes, and other articles in a smaller amount.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that the Navy Department states that this nominal cost of 10 per cent is to provide for distribution so as to relieve them of the necessity of having an appropriation for distributing the clothing?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. That is what was in the minds of those who considered the question.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not also true that this is substantially the same provision for the distribution of Navy clothing that the House has heretofore approved on numerous occasions for the distribution of obsolete Army clothing?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The prices charged the charitable organizations in this resolution are the same that the Army is getting for its articles that are not needed.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER. In what respect are these Navy shoes obsolete? Do they have to have the latest style in the Navy or are they defective?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. A great many pairs of these shoes were bought 8 or 10 years ago, and they fear that unless we dispose of them the leather will deteriorate. In addition to this, some styles have been changed and they do not conform to the regulations that are now in force and consequently can not be used.

Mr. SCHAFER. Can not the United States Veterans' Bureau use some of this surplus clothing? Under the law they must furnish clothing to certain veterans of the World War who are without funds and who are hospitalized under the Veterans' Bureau. They must furnish clothing, in this way, to the inmates of 12 or 13 soldiers' homes.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I take it the branch of the Government to which the gentleman refers could use some of it, but the need by the charitable organizations is so much greater at the present time, it was the thought of the committee, that inasmuch as the Army had disposed of their surplus clothing in this way, the Navy should be allowed to dispose of their surplus so that the charitable organizations may have the benefit of same for the needy people in the country at the present time.

Mr. SCHAFER. Why would it not be a good idea not to sell it to charitable institutions, but to give it to them through the Red Cross the same as we disposed of the wheat and the cotton?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. This is virtually a gift, I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. Who is it that makes these purchases in such a way that we have such a surplus of overcoats as 84,000?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The Navy Department explained that these overcoats, when they had been finished, were bound up in bales and because of the dye which was purchased during the World War being more or less of an inferior quality, they had changed in color or had faded in some respects and for this reason could not be used for the purpose of taking care of the men at the present time.

Mr. SNELL. How long in advance do they buy this clothing for the Navy?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. That is a question I can not answer.

Mr. SNELL. I think that is an important question to be considered by this House. For instance, in your naval appropriation bill this year, how much money will you carry for new uniforms and various articles of this kind?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Of course, that comes under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SNELL. I did not know but what the gentleman could give me the information.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. We have appointed a subcommittee of the Naval Affairs Committee to meet with a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee to make an exhaustive investigation of the very point that the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. SNELL. I think now is the time to make this investigation. One gentleman suggested that the Army got rid of their clothing in this way and for that reason we should give this opportunity to the Navy. I do not agree with that argument. I would like to know whether there are any excess purchases being made and whether we are authorizing more purchases than they actually need. There is some reason for having 84,000 extra overcoats, and I do not believe anybody can explain that.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I am in hearty accord with the gentleman. I think that is a question that ought to be looked into.

Mr. SNELL. I think the gentleman ought to be able to give us that information before we vote to give away these 84,000 overcoats.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. If the gentleman will yield to me, I think I can answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama, who is a member of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. In reply to the gentleman's question, we had a number of hearings on the question of the sale of this surplus War Department property and the evidence showed that the surplus property came from property that was bought during the World War.

Mr. SNELL. Let me ask the gentleman if this is property that was purchased during the World War?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. It is. Some of it was purchased 10 or 12 years ago.

Mr. SNELL. But the war has been over 15 years.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Yes; but the material was bought at that time and has been made up since the World War, and because the garments have faded in color they will never be used by the Navy, according to their regulations.

Mr. SNELL. What about the underwear—has that gone out of style? [Laughter.] I think that is nothing to be laughed at. I think that is important in spending money for this purpose.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The underwear was probably made for severe weather, such as existed during the war, but it is not the kind that is being used at the present time.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I demand the regular order.

Mr. SNELL. If there is too much of a demand for the regular order, I shall object.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I hope the gentleman will allow me to answer these questions.

Mr. McSWAIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. McSWAIN. Is not this property what is strictly called surplus property of the Navy, and the property will not be used by the Navy?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. No; it will not be used. It will lie there and deteriorate.

Mr. SNELL. How did it get this surplus amount? Let us cut it down, so that they will not buy another surplus. I think now is the time to call attention to it.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I am heartily in accord with the gentleman's views.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I want to say that I heartily concur in the views of the gentleman from New York and the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, but the reason we have this surplus is not on account of the war. We are going to have a surplus every year. It is a matter that I have called to the attention of Congress every year when we have had the appropriation bill under consideration. The purchase of clothing is not according to the number constituting the standing Army. These purchases are made annually according to a certain number, which enables the War Department to demand a minimum requirement in case of emergency. That is a policy that the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from South Carolina have accepted in the appropriation bills every year. It is not the fault of the department. It is the fault of Congress.

Mr. SNELL. Why not cut it down, so that we will not have a surplus every year to become obsolete?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I agree to that, but under the present policy you are going to have a surplus each year.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Where is this surplus clothing stored?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. In the Bush Terminal Building, in New York.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will it be purchased f. o. b. there? If so, it may be quite a hardship on the gentleman's State and my own State.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I take it that the small price charged will be utilized in a proper way to hasten the distribution.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. I have heard it stated that there are 75,000 sweaters and 75,000 jerseys in this surplus; are they out of style?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I am told that they are not used by the men. The regulations have been changed so that they will not be used. I raised the same point in the committee that the gentleman has raised.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman will admit that the system is a mighty poor one, when we accumulate such surpluses that we have to give them away.

Mr. DYER. But it is fortunate that it occurs at this time, when it can go to those who can use it and who need it.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The committee was of the opinion that it would be better to dispose of this surplus clothing through the charitable organizations rather than to let it remain in storage.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman accept the amendment to include the Territories of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska? They are in terrible condition in Alaska.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I hope the gentleman will take into consideration the fact that the distances to those places are so great the people there would probably not desire to make the purchases on this basis.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. But we have regular transports going to Puerto Rico. There will be no harm done.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I have authority only to present this one amendment.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I did not hear the gentleman state what type of distribution or allocation in the different States would be used to determine how these goods shall be distributed.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The population of the various States will be taken into consideration and then percentages based on the population will be allocated to the various States. This amendment makes it sure that each State will participate in a fair way.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to, and the resolution, as amended, was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 13710) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13710, with Mr. BLAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose the point of order had been reserved against the paragraph beginning on page 67 and ending on line 6, page 68.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] reserved the point of order against this paragraph when the bill was last discussed in the Committee of the Whole. He is temporarily out of the Hall, and has directed me to announce that he withdraws his point of order.

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ARENTZ: Page 68, line 2, after the word "furnishings," insert "including maps, globes, stationery, books, schoolroom equipment."

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Chairman, a little time spent now is going to be well spent, rather than to rush over this thing hurriedly without bringing to the attention of the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation the things that should and must be done at Boulder City. I am a defeated candidate, I am not coming back next Congress, but I do want to see the children of workmen at Boulder City taken care of. My purpose in rising to-day and offering this amendment is to bring certain things to the attention of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS], and also to the members of the subcommittee and the Members on the floor of the House on the Republican side of the House. As these gentlemen know, in September there were 651 school children at Boulder City. The first, the second, the third, and the sixth grades only could attend school half a day because there was no room. I told these facts to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] a few days ago when this bill was being considered, and I asked him to please look into them. Undoubtedly he has done so and for that reason has withdrawn his reservation of the point of order. The \$18,000 appropriated is for the building of four more rooms in the temporary structure. At the present time, instead of 651 attending this school, they have 700. The schoolrooms are crowded. The fathers and mothers of these children live in Boulder City. It is a governmental city. The State of Nevada has nothing to do with this, because it is forbidden to have any participation in the city because of the fact that it is declared to be a Federal reservation, according to a decision made by the Secretary of the Interior. He has been talking about taking care of the children of the United States and giving them proper school facilities. I insist that if they do not permit the State of Nevada to do it, the Federal Government must do it. You can not expect a corporation to do certain things for the Federal Government unless in return that corporation gets something.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENTZ. Not now. For instance, the Six Companies that have the contract for the building of Boulder Canyon Dam pay for the teachers. There is one firm of Wilcox & Babcock who have the contract for the 30-foot diameter pipe 2½ inches thick that is going to be put into the 50-foot tunnel. They have been asked to pay for the teachers in the high schools. It is a sad commentary on this Government that the Federal Government itself can not step into the picture and pay for its own teachers and supply the necessary school facilities for the children of the workmen at Boulder Dam, or better still, allow the State of Nevada to tax private property within the reservation and have its superintendent of education administer Boulder City schools.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENTZ. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. I have consulted with the members of the committee, and inasmuch as this does not increase the appropriation any, I shall withdraw the point of order and accept the amendment.

Mr. ARENTZ. Just a moment, if I may finish—

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, I desire to have it recorded that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. SNELL. Let us have the point of order and get rid of it now.

Mr. SWING. The point of order is that there is no existing legislation authorizing the expenditure of money for this purpose.

Mr. SNELL. Does the gentleman make the point of order against the whole section or against the amendment?

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from Oklahoma reserved the point of order. There has been debate since he made that point of order and I think the gentleman from California is too late to make the point of order.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from California is not too late because the gentleman was on his feet immediately I withdrew the reservation, and renewed it. I do not think the gentleman should be precluded from making the point of order. The gentleman was on his feet immediately after I withdrew the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BLAND). The Chair is ready to rule. The position taken by the gentleman from Oklahoma is correct.

Mr. SWING. May I reserve the point of order for just a moment although I do not intend to press it? This will probably be the last statement I will have occasion to make regarding the Boulder Dam project, with which I had something to do in the beginning.

The language in the authorization, as carried in the Swing-Johnson bill is:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to construct a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Black Canyon.

Expanding that authorization the Secretary of the Interior has spent several hundred thousand dollars building permanent structures, separate and distinct from the dam, creating a new city with sewers, sidewalks, paved streets, parks, electric lights, a water system, a fire department, police department, and everything else incident to a modern city in the State of Nevada, all of which must be repaid with 4 per cent interest by the contract users of water and power residing in the State of California.

Now, I have no desire or intention of acting niggardly or small regarding expenditures already made in connection with a project so great and so important to my State as this Boulder Dam project is, but I do want to take this opportunity to call the attention of the committee to the strict limitation of the language of the Boulder Dam act, and to ask that in the future when requests are made for appropriations from this fund for extraneous matters that the language of the bill be looked at, and that the Committee on Appropriations confine itself to the authorization contained in the act, at least, until such time as a new authorization is brought in. It has even been suggested that the Government build swimming pools and such things, which must be paid back by the users of the water and power, with 4 per cent interest. Such objects, no matter how worthy, are clearly outside the law authorizing the project.

I withdraw the reservation of the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order and will reserve it in order that I may get some information. I have no quarrel with the gentleman from Oklahoma, chairman of the subcommittee, in stating that he will not make the point of order inasmuch as this does not increase the authorization; but I am disturbed about the proposition of whether or not this is to be considered as a precedent hereafter to place the obligation upon the Federal Government when it gives employment to men on public works, to furnish schools, school-teachers, and educational equipment in plants of that sort, simply because it is under Federal jurisdiction. I would like to have some information on that as a matter of principle.

Mr. ARENTZ. If the officials at Boulder City will turn over to the State of Nevada the right to tax the property in that city to raise sufficient funds to erect a school building and pay for the teachers, the State of Nevada will gladly do this. This area is declared a Federal reserve by the Secretary of the Interior. The State of Nevada has been foreclosed, apparently, by decision of the Secretary of the Interior, with which we do not agree, from having anything to say about this reservation. There are 700 school children here at this moment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. This question of Federal interference in education of children is a rather delicate question in the House of Representatives. I must confess I have somewhat changed my views on it, because I formerly advocated the establishment of a department of education. I do not think I would do so now. But if the Federal Government is given the right to furnish this schoolhouse and to employ teachers, can it not direct the method of education that is to be conducted in those schools?

Mr. ARENTZ. Oh, certainly it can. It does, for through Mr. Sims Ely, who is in charge of Boulder, it does as it pleases.

Mr. GOSS. In view of the statement of the gentleman I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on that.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order until I ask a question?

Mr. GOSS. Yes; I reserve the point of order.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I understand at West Point the Federal Government furnishes the schools and the education. Also in the Canal Zone and in Alaska.

Mr. GOSS. But the students are free to worship under whatever creed they desire.

Mr. ARENTZ. Well, of course that is true at Boulder City.

Mr. GOSS. That was my objection.

Mr. ARENTZ. Well, the gentleman should not have that objection.

Mr. GOSS. I understood the gentleman to say that.

Mr. ARENTZ. No, no. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. GOSS. Then I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not intend to object to this proposition, but my inquiry was based on the proposition of undertaking to secure some information as to whether this might be a dangerous precedent for us to establish. Under the circumstances, I will withdraw the reservation of the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ARENTZ].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to insert a letter at this point from Doctor Mead, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENTZ. In all that I have said here my sole purpose has been to help the school system at Boulder City, a city created by legislation introduced by me to carry on or facilitate the construction of a great work advanced through this House by my colleague, Mr. PHIL SWING, and myself.

In the first place, I want the walls of each room in the new schoolhouse retinted and refinished. They are now painted a dead white and reflect sunlight like a mirror.

Maps, globes, and scratch paper should be supplied to each room and stationery to the principal. Free books should be supplied to each child in attendance, and the school should be made an accredited one as soon as possible by making it equal in standing to all the schools of Nevada. The principal should be given full authority.

The letter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, December 19, 1932.

HON. SAMUEL S. ARENTZ,
House of Representatives, United States.

DEAR MR. ARENTZ: Miss SCHNITT has told me of your interest in the schools at Boulder City and your desire to have them better equipped. A letter has gone to Mr. Sims Ely about the information you requested.

Let me say that I was in the schools at Boulder City last week and came away impressed with their needs. To begin with, there are now 700 children in that school building—580 in the grades and 120 in the high school. I do not believe there is a finer group of teachers to be found anywhere, nor one whose hearts are more fully in their work. They are all college or university graduates. One has been a teacher in the University of London. It is certain that after the beginning of the year the number of pupils will be increased and more room must be provided. While I was there it was arranged to have the two unfinished basement rooms made ready for use.

Last year the Library of Congress gave us about 2,000 books, which have not yet been shipped because we did not know where to get the money to meet the expense. While at Boulder City we made provision for housing the books in the municipal building, which is close enough to the school to make them available for the children and also to the public. The Union Pacific Railroad has agreed to give us reduced rates over its road, and we are at work now trying to get reduced rates for the rest of the way.

As soon as Mr. Ely replies I will come up and see you. Meanwhile your interest in this matter is appreciated.

Very truly yours,

ELWOOD MEAD, Commissioner.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 64 of the bill, to the paragraph beginning with line 11 for the purpose of offering a perfecting amendment which I discussed with the members of the committee. The amendment I offer is after the word "of" to insert the word "existing."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I object to that.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Goss: On page 63, in line 6, after the word "act," insert the following: "Provided further, That no part of any appropriation in this act for the Bureau of Reclamation shall be used for investigations to determine the economic and/or financial feasibility of any new reclamation project."

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BLAND). The Chair is ready to rule. The amendment is a limitation, and consequently held to be in order.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I have consulted with the chairman of the subcommittee with reference to this matter, and it simply carries out what the committee attempted to do when the committee considered this bill a few days ago, in that the debate showed there was no disposition on the part of the committee to survey new projects. That I would construe not to mean a unit of a new project of an existing project; and so in order to clarify the language when the word "new" was stricken out and excepted by the committee, I have offered this amendment which I understand the chairman of the subcommittee does not object to.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I yield.

Mr. LEAVITT. The money that is being limited by the gentleman's amendment is now used in cooperation with the local communities in some cases to determine the feasibility of putting water on existing areas that are being cultivated.

Mr. GOSS. I would say to the gentleman from Montana that this amendment does not affect any existing projects; it applies only to new projects.

Mr. LEAVITT. Some of them have no water at this time. The question of how to put water on them is very vital to the local communities and to the people that are involved.

Mr. GOSS. I understand the gentleman voted against the amendment I offered the other day. He would be opposed to this one.

Mr. LEAVITT. That is not the question. I want to know whether the gentleman intends to cut out all the cooperative work. That is one of the valuable things that is carried on by the Reclamation Service.

Mr. GOSS. I will say to the gentleman the purpose of my amendment is only to stop investigations or surveys of new projects, as was brought out in the hearing by the gentleman from Idaho. There was no intention of going into new projects. All my amendment does is to stop new projects, not any work on existing projects.

Mr. LEAVITT. Does the gentleman mean by that the existing governmental projects, or does the gentleman want to cut out this cooperative work with the local States and communities that has to do with determining the feasibility of placing water on farms that are already occupied?

Mr. GOSS. No; I have no objection to that. That was taken care of in another part of the bill. That is not contained in this paragraph. I have no objection to that.

Mr. LEAVITT. I feared the gentleman's amendment would preclude the use of any funds for cooperative work, and I wanted to be sure.

Mr. GOSS. I will say to the gentleman from Montana that had not objection been made to my returning to page 64 and offering an amendment, the matter would have been cleared up.

Mr. LEAVITT. The gentleman knows I did not make any objection to that.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. I may state to the gentleman from Connecticut that it has been definitely stated by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee for the past three years that no new projects are contemplated.

Mr. GOSS. That is correct.

Mr. CULKIN. And I can not see where there could be any objection to the gentleman's amendment, assuming that the statement is in good faith, which I do not doubt.

Mr. GOSS. I wish to ask the chairman if he has any objection to this amendment?

Mr. HASTINGS. We have examined the amendment and we think it is in the nature of a perfecting amendment to line 14, page 64, and so far as I am concerned I have no objection.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is well known that the present policy of the Interior Department is not to undertake any new projects by putting water on virgin un reclaimed lands. There has been no appropriation made for that purpose, and so far as I know none is contemplated; but there is a service, and a very useful service, in the Bureau of Reclamation which enables that bureau to cooperate with the States in making investigation of units of the projects already undertaken. This service ought not to be handicapped.

I fear the effect of this amendment, as I read it, would be to stop all investigation and to stop all this cooperative work, and in my judgment we will make a mistake. I hope that interpretation is not justified and will not be accepted. It is in the power of Congress to say when new construction work should be started, and I do not think there ought to be any attempt to stop investigation work. I do not think there should be a limitation placed on the very useful and necessary cooperative work that is being carried on between the States and the bureau. That is the reason I objected to the gentleman returning to page 64, because I think that would have a very limiting and detrimental effect.

Mr. GOSS. I will say to the gentleman there is no intention of having this apply to a new unit already existing. What I meant was that it should not apply to a new investigation for a new unit which is not in existence.

Mr. COLTON. The gentleman has partly removed my apprehension. I think if the gentleman had made that

clear in his first statement I should not have objected to returning to page 64; but I want it perfectly clear that this fine work that is being carried on before the construction of new units is commenced shall not be interfered with in any way.

Mr. GOSS. On existing projects.

Mr. COLTON. Yes; new units of existing projects.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. Yes.

Mr. CULKIN. Is it not a fact that on the Columbia River project, which involves the reclamation of 1,250,000 acres, the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture are entirely at variance?

Mr. COLTON. I am not advised on that and could not answer the question.

Mr. CULKIN. Is it not a fact that the Secretary of the Interior and his associates favor that project?

Mr. COLTON. As I say, I am not advised on that.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman is not familiar with that?

Mr. COLTON. No; I am not.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman does not know that the Department of the Interior is committed on this proposition and is bound to go on with the reclamation of the Columbia River Basin?

Mr. COLTON. No; I could not subscribe to that, if the gentleman has in mind reclaiming new lands.

Mr. CULKIN. That is what I understand, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. COLTON. I think the Department of the Interior is carrying out in good faith the policy that there will be no new construction of new projects under the Reclamation Service.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Referring to the query just made as to the Columbia Basin, the Secretary of the Interior is not recommending that we proceed with this project at this time at all. There is the construction of a dam contemplated at a future time when conditions justify it and when the power is contracted for; and the construction of that dam, if the power is sufficiently contracted for to repay cost of construction, would require some 10 years, and reclamation would not be considered until years after that.

Mr. CULKIN. If I may ask the gentleman a question at this point. Is it not a fact that the employees of the Interior Department are writing and spreading propaganda throughout the United States at this time in favor of that project? Men in the employ of the Government are advocating the disbursement of \$450,000,000 for the purpose of this Columbia River project.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Not to my knowledge, and there is not that amount of money involved, in any event.

Mr. CULKIN. That is the figure. I have seen it repeatedly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Goss].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to an agreement to return to a previous provision in the bill, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McKEOWN: On page 52, after line 23, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"The Secretary of Interior is hereby authorized to pay to members of the Sac and Fox Tribes in Oklahoma born on or after October 20, 1923, the date of approval of the final roll of said tribe, and living on the date of the passage of this act, the sum of \$82.84 each from any funds now on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of said Sac and Fox Indians of Oklahoma."

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how did we get back to this part of the bill?

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not authorized by existing law and is not germane.

Mr. McKEOWN. It was agreed that we would go back to this part of the bill when the amendment was first offered.

The CHAIRMAN. By unanimous consent this paragraph was passed over the other day.

Mr. SNELL. That is all right, but I reserve a point of order.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane and is also legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. McKEOWN. May I ask the gentleman if that is all the point of order that he has?

Mr. GOSS. That is enough.

Mr. McKEOWN. We have a statute based on the treaty of 1837, and we have been paying under that all the time.

Mr. GOSS. The gentleman is not speaking to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. McKEOWN. I just want to call the attention of the Chair to the fact—

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the point of order.

Mr. McKEOWN. How can I discuss the point of order unless the gentleman from Connecticut will wait a moment? I am trying to tell you that it is provided by law. The treaty of 1837, under which all of these per capita payments have been made to the Sac and Fox Indians, provides that in the Treasury of the United States there shall be kept a fund of their own money—this does not come out of the Treasury—of \$100,000 to be invested at a rate of not less than 5 per cent and to be paid out in per capita payments. That is the authority for this amendment. What is the matter with that authority?

Mr. GOSS. I also made the point of order that the amendment was not germane.

Mr. McKEOWN. What is not germane?

Mr. GOSS. The gentleman's amendment.

Mr. McKEOWN. Why is it not germane?

Mr. GOSS. Let the Chair settle that.

Mr. McKEOWN. I want the gentleman to tell us why it is not germane.

Mr. GOSS. That is up to the gentleman and not up to me.

Mr. McKEOWN. It is not up to me at all.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, with respect to the point of order, I have examined the statute, and the statute does not authorize appropriations by Congress for the purpose of making these per capita payments. I very deeply regret it, but this amendment has not been considered by the committee, was not presented to the committee, and there was no information as to how many members of the tribe there are or where they are or how much money they have to their credit, and for these reasons I must join in insisting upon the point of order, both as to not being authorized by the treaty that is referred to by my colleague and also because it is not germane at this place in the bill.

Mr. McKEOWN. If the gentleman will reserve it, I want to call attention to this condition. The Appropriations Committee calls its meetings before Congress convenes, and we who live in a distant part of the country have no opportunity to present these matters, so there ought to be some freedom allowed in presenting these things to the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Let me say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that there is a bill now pending before the Committee on Indian Affairs that will be reported soon taking care of this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that this amendment is germane, but the Chair thinks there is no

authorization of law for the amendment, and therefore sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Topographic surveys: For topographic surveys in various portions of the United States, \$450,000, of which amount not to exceed \$275,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended in cooperation with States or municipalities except upon the basis of the State or municipality bearing all of the expense incident thereto in excess of such an amount as is necessary for the Geological Survey to perform its share of standard topographic surveys, such share of the Geological Survey in no case exceeding 50 per cent of the cost of the survey: *Provided further*, That \$254,000 of this amount shall be available only for such cooperation with States or municipalities;

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 69, line 8, strike out the figures "\$450,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$512,000."

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have offered this amendment for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the committee and the subcommittee in charge of the bill facts which I think are peculiarly within my own knowledge.

In my first appearance here I made a promise to the committee and to the House that when I spoke it would be when I figured I had something worthy to bring to the attention of the House, and that I would not speak on other occasions.

This is perhaps one of my last appearances before the committee, and I expect to carry out that same idea.

The Geological Survey is the place where I had my first job. For four years I saw these men start their work at daylight in the morning and close when it got too dark to read the vernier on the instruments. I worked on this work in five different States. To-day they are doing the same kind of work. The limitation that has been made on the Budget estimate for the Geological Survey will take them out of that particular field work, which is the predominant work that they do.

Now, I have no desire to press this amendment, but I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether it would not be possible for him to state if the bureau finds additional sums are being appropriated from individual States which would require additional contribution from the Federal Government—whether he would not consider making a statement that the deficiency committee would consider additional appropriations.

Mr. HASTINGS. If the gentleman's inquiry is addressed to me, I would say that I am not a member of the Deficiency Subcommittee on Appropriations. Of course, I can not make any answer to the gentleman's question or any promise. I take it that the subcommittee in considering the Geological Survey or any other department of the Government would give it proper consideration regardless of anything I might say here now.

Mr. COYLE. I will say to the gentleman that I realize that limitation which he states. My remarks were addressed to his interest and good will to have the Budget take into consideration the reduced amount of the survey and that expected to be received from individual States. The amount was first reduced and then again reduced by \$62,000. In other words, reductions have been twice made.

Mr. HASTINGS. The subcommittee having the bill in charge considered that there was no necessity for a larger appropriation for the Geological Survey. They did not believe that during these exceptionally hard times that the money would be forthcoming from the various States that are so highly burdened with taxes. They therefore thought that \$450,000 would be adequate.

Now, the amount appropriated in 1927 was \$451,700. When the Treasury was behind last June \$903,000,000 and when it was behind last year \$2,885,000,000 and every State in the Union finds itself in great need of money to run the State, we thought that this was a liberal allocation of the amount of money.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me, any amount appropriated by the Federal Government at this time might very well be so limited I take it that it would not be expended unless the cooperative appropriation did come from the individual States.

Mr. HASTINGS. That is correct.

Mr. COYLE. If it did not so come, it would not be an added expenditure, and I suppose the committee rather fears they would ask in subsequent years that it be kept alive from year to year.

Mr. HASTINGS. The committee felt that this amount would be all that would be needed for the coming year, owing to economic conditions.

Mr. COYLE. If it were found that the additional amount were needed, could we call on the good offices of the committee to see that those funds were provided?

Mr. HASTINGS. These figures are those that the present subcommittee and the full committee have recommended to the House, and we believe, in view of appropriations that have been made, and in view of the very hard time the States are having in recent years to meet their expenses, that \$450,000, which is approximately the amount appropriated in 1927, will be adequate and will be more than would be met by the several States for this class of work.

Mr. COYLE. I have no desire to press the amendment, with the comparatively few Members who are here, and as a consequence, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Volcanologic surveys: For volcanologic surveys, measurements, and observatories in Hawaii, including subordinate stations elsewhere, \$12,500.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii: Page 70, line 3, strike out "\$12,500" and insert "\$18,500."

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this may appear to be a very small question. It has to deal with the prediction and warning as to earthquakes and volcanic activity. In 1932 the appropriation which the Budget recommended was cut 57 per cent and this year the budgetary requirements and estimates as they were sent to the committee have been cut a further figure of 30 per cent, so that the operations which have been conducted in the past have been reduced from the year 1932 to a level of about 34 per cent. To those who do not live in the neighborhood of volcanoes this may not appear to be very important, but may I not point out to the committee that since the year 1906, when the San Francisco earthquake and fire took place, up to the year 1930, nearly 400,000 people have lost their lives by reason of earthquakes and volcanic phenomena, and nearly, we might say, a billion dollars worth of property has been destroyed. Does it not seem worth while to take an ounce of prevention ahead of time in order that we may know at least as near as science may be able to anticipate such occurrences, what is to take place? It is interesting to know that in connection with the last explosive eruption at the Volcano of Kilauea, in the Territory of Hawaii, which, by the way, is within a Federal reservation, a national park, as is Mauna Loa within a national park, it is estimated that a volume of matter equivalent to \$20,000,000,000 cubic feet disappeared from underneath the crust of the earth. That is a situation which it is almost impossible to contemplate. So I have asked for this small increase in the appropriation of from \$12,500 to \$18,500 in order that the very small and restricted scientific observations that are now being carried on under the auspices of our Federal Government, aided and assisted by local contributions to the extent of more than dollar for dollar, may be continued, that we may receive warning and predic-

tion ahead of time, in order that we may not be overwhelmed with a catastrophe.

May I not ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he will accept the amendment?

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Then I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Printing and binding, etc.: For printing and binding, \$100,000; for preparation of illustrations \$15,000; and for engraving and printing geologic and topographic maps, \$85,000; in all, \$200,000.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if in this change, amounting to \$50,000 in the amount appropriated for printing and binding and illustrating, there has been taken into consideration the piled-up mass, I might say, of the work of the topographic and geological survey that has not been printed, has not been edited, and is not available for any purpose whatsoever? For example, in his State and mine, year after year, we appropriate from \$15,000 to \$25,000 to use in connection with work of the Geological Survey. The work is done in the field in the summer time. The plates and records are first sent in to the offices in the West and then, I assume, come here to the offices in Washington, and every time that we ask them for a report of what has been done in that State they tell us they have insufficient money to edit or print the reports, and we can get hardly any of the work that has been done in the last six or eight years, because the appropriation for printing and binding is so little. We continue to appropriate by every legislature, and our legislature appropriates biennially, a sufficient sum to meet the requirement of the Geological Survey, and I am wondering if by this cut you have now absolutely cut out for the next 2-year period any continuance of the work, either from the standpoint of the topographic and geological survey or of printing reports. We ought to have an answer from Congress this time so that the legislature of our State, which will meet the first of next month, may know how to continue our appropriations for the ensuing 2-year period.

Mr. HASTINGS. In answer to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. EATON], permit me to say that we think this is a rather large amount—\$200,000. In view of the fact that the work of the Geological Survey for topographic maps and other work done by this bureau is slowing down, the committee, after very careful consideration, felt that \$200,000 would be adequate. If we go back to the year 1927, for instance, when times were unquestionably much better than they are now, the appropriation for this particular item was but a little more, namely, \$214,000. So this is within \$14,000 of the appropriation made in 1927.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. The gentleman misses my point. I am not complaining about cutting down this amount, but I want a definite statement of the committee whether in cutting down this amount to \$200,000 you are giving notice to the State of Colorado, for example, that it shall no longer continue its joint appropriations and that we are not going to get any of these records printed in the next two years. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] probably knows more about these details than the gentleman from Oklahoma or I.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. If my colleague will yield, the Interior Department Subcommittee on Appropriations is very sympathetic with the Geological Survey and nearly all of its work, and there is no disposition among the members of that committee or the general Committee on Appropriations to cripple or seriously impede or delay their services. But, with all due respect, it sometimes seems to me personally that that bureau has less disposition to properly recognize the serious financial condition of the country and the depleted condition of the Federal Treasury and the absolute necessity of reducing expenditures in this department as

well as the other departments than it should have. The members of this committee are persistently beseeched to make no reductions for this bureau, and we have not made any that we feel are unjust. In fact, we have considered them all very carefully and, as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS], has well said, we felt that this reduction is not going to jeopardize seriously the work provided for by this appropriation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph be concluded in two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. May I inquire of my colleague whether he and I should advise our legislature, therefore, not to appropriate for the next biennium to meet any part of expenditures which might otherwise come out of this appropriation which has been reduced 20 per cent—from \$250,000 to \$200,000. That is a very appreciable reduction.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. There is no disposition upon the part of this committee to do anything that would tend to limit the action of the Colorado Legislature. What we think is that this amount appropriated is enough to amply cover the necessary work of the Geological Survey during the coming fiscal year, and we have recommended this appropriation accordingly.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Let me ask the gentleman directly, then: By this cut is the work done by the United States in cooperation with the topographical and geological surveys of the State of Colorado intended to be cut out? And no printing thereof is to be available during the next year?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No. We are not intending to cut out that work at all. I think the appropriation is enough to take care of all the work the State will want to do. As a matter of fact, the information which comes to the committee is that there will be very small or no appropriations made by any of the States for this work during this next year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

The total of the foregoing amounts shall be immediately available in one fund for the National Park Service: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall not authorize for expenditure prior to July 1, 1933, any of the amounts herein appropriated except those for construction of physical improvements, for tree-disease and insect-control work, for fire-prevention measures, and for the purchase of equipment: *Provided further*, That in the settlement of the accounts of the National Park Service the amount herein made available for each national park and other main headings shall not be exceeded, except that 10 per cent of the foregoing amounts shall be available interchangeably for expenditures in the various national parks named, and in the national monuments, but not more than 10 per cent shall be added to the amount appropriated for any one of said parks or monuments or for any particular item within a park or monument: *Provided further*, That any interchange of appropriations hereunder shall be reported to Congress in the annual Budget.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. HASTINGS: On page 85, strike out lines 17 to 25, inclusive, and on page 86, strike out lines 1 to 11, inclusive, and insert the following:

"The foregoing amounts for the National Park Service available for construction of physical improvements, for tree-disease and insect-control work, for fire-prevention measures, and for the purchase of equipment, shall be immediately available for such purposes."

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, that just strikes out the 10 per cent interchangeable and makes the other immedi-

ately available, and is in accordance with amendments heretofore adopted.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the Commissioner of Education and other personal services in the District of Columbia, \$250,000.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 5 and vacate the proceedings by which the two amendments offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] were adopted in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I beg to say that the gentleman from Mississippi, chairman of one of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, was conducting hearings at the time my amendments were offered and while I am still in favor of the amendments, and think they should prevail, I think it is only fair to the gentleman that he should have the privilege of being here, and I shall be glad to join with the gentleman in the request, so that he may be present when the items are considered.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendments offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] are pending. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] is recognized.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

I am defending the action of the full Committee on Appropriations in reducing this item from \$40,000 to \$20,000. The Department of Education was originally founded for the purpose of supervising the educational activities of governmental operated educational activities. It was never intended originally that the Bureau of Education should supervise educational work throughout the States. However, gradually this bureau has assumed more authority and is steadily growing. In its desire to gather additional power it has seen fit to engage in political activities. For instance, last year when the War Department appropriation bill was pending this department published as an official document, written by a Major Bishop, a reserve officer, in favor of compulsory military education in the schools of the country. It does not make any difference whether one believes in compulsory military education in the schools or not. That is immaterial. The fact to which I direct your attention is that we have a Bureau of Education that is taking sides on a purely political subject and subjects beyond the scope of its authority. A new Commissioner of Education perhaps will differ with the present one and may publish a pamphlet on the other side of that question. The present commissioner has made a speech against the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people. I do not know whether he has put out a pamphlet on that subject, but he can with equal propriety get out a pamphlet on this subject, and I dare say if he continues as commissioner we may look for a pamphlet on the whole category of political and economic subjects.

The thought I am presenting to you is that so long as this bureau is engaged in educational work or the direction of educators toward proper methods of instructing the youth of the country its activities are rightly directed, but taking sides on purely political and economic subjects is something entirely different and should be condemned.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Were these pamphlets printed at public expense?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; and not only printed at public expense, but sold to certain organizations that distributed them under Government frank.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. But is it not a matter of general information, and are not the people interested in the opinion of such a man as the Commissioner of Education?

Mr. COLLINS. The pamphlet referred to was not written by him. It was written by Major Bishop, not a Regular Army officer, who is the paid representative of a propaganda organization with headquarters in Washington.

I make the contention that your views on the merits of the subject of the pamphlet is beside the question. The question for us to decide is whether this is a subject matter about which this bureau is concerned, and that I deny. Second, even though it has the power and authority to make an investigation of the subject, the commissioner, or some one under him, should do it and not lend itself to a propaganda agency such as that represented by the major in the instance I have cited.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on these amendments and all amendments hereto close in 25 minutes, to be equally divided between those favoring the amendment and those opposing it.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COLLINS. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, this appropriation was \$40,000 last year. It is proposed to make it \$40,000 this year.

The entire Public Health Service of the United States had only \$53,000 for printing and binding.

The entire appropriation for the District of Columbia is \$70,000. This covers tax notices and receipts, notices of all kinds, administration printing, water bills, auto notices, and every kind of printing done by the District of Columbia.

The appropriation for the Public Health Service covers all of their bulletins, their scientific research, their public health reports, and all of the printing done for them.

This bureau should take its share of reduction in printing the same as the other departments and activities of this Government, yet no proposal is made to reduce this appropriation from the \$40,000, which it was last year, but rather to continue it the same for this fiscal year. I submit that the reduction for printing and binding for this bureau from \$40,000 to \$20,000 is a reasonable one. Twenty thousand dollars should cover all of the printed matter that they can properly put out. I do not have a copy of all of the publications it puts out, but I have been advised that many of them are of a questionable nature, as was the one to which I have already directed your attention.

This matter was presented to the full Appropriations Committee and fully discussed by the members of the whole committee, and the reduction from \$40,000 to \$20,000 was written into the bill. I urge the House to stand by the action of the full Appropriations Committee and vote down the amendment to increase this item from \$20,000 to \$40,000. Let this bureau take its share of reduction the same as the other activities of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLZEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to bring a few facts to the attention of the committee in favor of this appropriation in the sum of \$40,000 to be used by the Office of Education for printing. The appropriation for this office for 1932 was \$62,000. Last year it was reduced to \$40,000, a decrease of \$22,000, or 36 per cent. Now, my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] proposes to reduce it again to \$20,000, making in two years a total reduction of 68 per cent.

It is my understanding that the sum expended by the Office of Education represents the total cost for printing periodicals, survey reports, and so forth, which are distributed throughout the entire Nation. I am in favor of rigid economy, and I think the Bureau of Education should be willing to effect economies in its own operation; but a reduction of 68 per cent within two years is almost destructive. I do not believe you favor this drastic reduction.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] made a comparison relative to the cost of printing in some of the other departments. I have some figures here which I shall submit for your consideration. For the year 1933, for the Office of Education, and you understand this includes the surveys, magazines, and periodicals which go to the libraries, the presidents of universities, and departments of education throughout the entire Nation, the cost of printing was only \$40,000. The gentleman from Mississippi forgot to tell you that in the Department of Agriculture last year the printing amounted to the sum of \$925,000; for the Department of Commerce, \$600,000; for the Army, \$500,000; and for the Navy, \$550,000.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that about a year ago Mr. Bishop advised the United States Commissioner of Education that he had some money available that might be used for a scientific survey or study of the educational value of military instruction in universities and colleges.

After receiving this information the Commissioner of Education sent out 16,000 questionnaires to Reserve Officers' Training Corps graduates and received 10,000 replies. Following this the Bureau of Education printed 6,000 copies of this pamphlet, No. 28, and I presume this is the one to which the gentleman from Mississippi refers. They have been distributed very largely to libraries, to presidents of colleges and universities. I am advised by the Bureau of Education that the Research Organization on Military Education made large purchases from the Superintendent of Documents and then had them distributed.

I want to also call your attention to the laughable suggestion about political propaganda. I say this with a bit of apology, because I voted in most instances with the gentleman from Mississippi on appropriations for the Army last year; but I say to you now that I shall not in some cases do so this time, because of a careful study which I have recently made. This pamphlet was sent to my district, just the same as it was sent to my colleague's district in Mississippi and to yours. Let me call your attention to a few facts about the pamphlet No. 28, which contains the so-called propaganda. It is nothing on earth but a scientific, educational survey and the report thereon.

I submit to you one of the questions and ask if this sounds like political propaganda. Please note that this is a typical question in this survey, which was sent to 16,000 Reserve Officers' Training Corps graduates:

No. 5. In your opinion did military training aid or make easier the development in your own life of one or more of the qualities or characteristics listed below: Leadership, initiative, orderliness, disciplinary value—

And so forth. Next, there is a list of 54 institutions included in this study, and I submit to you that these institutions represent the best educational institutions of learning in all sections of the Nation. Is this political propaganda?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ELLZEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLZEY. Another item is an analysis of findings by institutions. Then, in this so-called political pamphlet, is a detailed analysis of the opinions.

Gentlemen, I submit to you, with these facts before you, this is just a scientific survey of this question, the Educational Value of Military Instruction in Universities and Colleges. It is simply information that the young manhood of the Nation is entitled to, and I for one, although I voted with the gentleman from Mississippi last year, have not one bit of objection to this information going to every man, woman, boy, and girl in my district. This is the so-called propaganda.

I repeat now that I hope the gentlemen of this committee will leave the appropriation where it has already been placed by the Committee of the Whole at \$40,000, which is a reduction, within the past two years, of 68 per cent. I cer-

tainly urge you to give this matter your careful consideration. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized for two minutes. Mr. Chairman, I think the Government of the United States appropriates less for education than any other government in proportion to its other appropriations. We appropriate \$270,000 for the Office of Education—\$250,000 for personal service in the District of Columbia and \$20,000 for traveling expenses, and so forth.

As has been explained here, the office of the Bureau of Education keeps in touch with State superintendents, with libraries, and educational thought everywhere throughout the country.

There are approximately 700,000 public-school teachers in the United States, and there are probably more than a million teachers all together.

This item of \$40,000 was presented to the subcommittee, which prepared the bill, as a most urgent one and one much needed. The committee, after full and careful consideration, thought it was not an excessive sum. It was the amount estimated by the Bureau of the Budget, and the same as the appropriation for last year. If we are going to have an Office of Education, it should have a sufficient sum to insure its activities being published.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, last week when this item came up I was surprised at the action of the members of the subcommittee in not opposing the motion to double the appropriation. I rose and wanted to know why the members of the Appropriations Committee were not taking some interest in it. I was of the opinion the committee was going to stand by its recommendation, and that was the reason I asked the question.

An effort is always made to justify the printing of any Government document. I recall some years ago when the annual report of the Bureau of Education was issued. It consisted of two volumes, each volume 2 inches or more thick.

This present month you were notified to get your obsolete public documents out of the basement of the Capitol. Ask the foreman of that room downstairs about the obsolete documents and you will find that this old report, issued annually, of the Commissioner of Education, in two volumes, is stored down there by the thousands and thousands. I had 50 or more to my credit.

The question is not whether you are justified in printing certain documents, but whether you are going to reduce Government expenditures. [Applause.] There is no reason why this appropriation should not be reduced, especially in these times of want and distress. Let it be reduced as all appropriations are being reduced.

So far as I am concerned I feel this item for printing documents for the Bureau of Education should be reduced. If you are going to keep your pledge to the people to reduce expenditures, here is an opportunity.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I wish to speak in favor of the amendment. If I did not know something of this amendment I should be inclined to follow the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] anyway, for he is one of the most assiduous watchdogs of the Treasury. Although a sincere believer in wise Government economy I have not always agreed with him when he has wanted to save or reduce appropriations, as I have felt he sometimes went too far. I do heartily agree with him now that we should appropriate enough money to enable this Department of Education to secure vital statistics for the schools and people of this country. A gap must not be created in these school statistics which have been gathered every year, by law, for the past 60 years. We ought to have all the available information that the school teachers need. In these times of great unrest there is an especial need for carefully prepared material upon educational matters. The Department of Education acts as a clearing house upon these matters. That the publications of this department are useful to the people of the United States is shown

by the fact that during the fiscal year 1932, more than 500,000 copies of publications were sold, for which the Government Printing Office received approximately \$25,000. Personally I have had a great many requests for a simple plan of money management. The Department of Education could secure material upon money management, and could distribute it to the school teachers who could teach it to the school children. The people all over the country could learn how to manage and balance their own budgets. As a result they could tell the officials who manage their municipal governments and their State governments and also the National Government, how to budget more wisely the State and municipal funds, as well as Uncle Sam's. The present economic crisis shows how economically illiterate most of us are. It is vital to my mind that the 60 years' material which has been authorized to be collected by Congress should not be stopped at this time. It is just giving our schools and the children a chance. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, while this item is not large, to my mind there is no reason why it should be treated differently from any other item in this or any other bill when it comes to the reduction of public expenditures. In my opinion, for a year at least, or until times get a little better, this and many other items could be cut out entirely without any great detriment to the Government or to the people of the United States. Let me call attention to something that is going on in the Interior Department where they are taking money out of the Treasury, some out of this item, though not so much, for a purpose not intended in the appropriation at all. We have down there a man named Depew, or something like that, who goes out into our western country and spends his vacation in some of the parks and other places, has a glorious time for three or four months, and then comes back and writes some sort of a pamphlet, the most of which is boosting himself. I understand now that after his last sojourn at the expense of the Government he is writing a book upon our parks and forests, and that it is going to be published and put on sale. He is to receive the benefit of it. A portion of this item is for the purpose of paying that gentleman, and that is only one of the many abuses of much of the appropriation that is being made not only in the Department of the Interior but in the Agricultural Department and some others. Vacations are spent at the expense of the Government, some going up to Alaska every year for no other purpose than to spend their vacation at the expense of the Government.

Mr. ELLZEY. Is not that a matter of administration in this department as in any other department?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes. If it were simply the expenditure of this money and the printing of things that are of use and worth while, the \$20,000 stated in the bill would be amply sufficient. It is the abuse of the thing to which we object. They have to cart out of the basement of this building every year not only wagonloads but trainloads of useless material printed at the expense of the Government without any good return.

Mr. ELLZEY. If this were properly administered, would the gentleman favor the appropriation?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The trouble with the administration is that it is left to those people who are trying to aggrandize themselves. That is true in the Department of the Interior, and I have given one example of it. This is not confined to the Interior Department alone; it is also true in various other departments. If this Government could save to the Treasury of the United States the money that is uselessly wasted in printing and in half a dozen other useless things, I dare say we would not have so much deficit at this time.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, just a word with respect to the main argument of my friend from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] who is opposed to the amendment. He rests his opposition chiefly upon the ground that the Bureau of Education published a pamphlet on military matters, and that in doing so it went far afield. That pamphlet is one of numerous publications of the bureau and I submit that its publication was in line with the clear authority given by the

law. On July 2, 1862, the Congress laid the foundation for colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts, and placed in large part the supervision and expenditure of moneys for these institutions upon the Department of the Interior. If you will turn to section 4 of the act to which I have referred, you will find that it is required that military instruction be offered. The Attorney General has ruled that while the States may not require the individual student to take military instruction, the States having these institutions must offer such courses. Hence I say that the particular pamphlet referred to, and for which a very small amount of money was expended, is one that properly comes under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Education.

No one can be more in earnest than am I in the matter of reducing expenditures of printing in this and other bureaus of the Government.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Not now. In 1902 we appropriated \$82,000 for printing for the Bureau of Education. Two years ago the Congress appropriated \$62,000. Last year the appropriation was cut to \$40,000. This year the Bureau of the Budget and your committee recommended \$40,000, and that is the sum in the amendment now pending, which I have offered. This expenditure of money may mean the saving of hundreds of thousands of dollars and perhaps millions to the people of the United States. Let me illustrate.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. In a moment. In the city of Portland, Oreg., 10 years ago the people were confronted with a building program to accommodate the increased number of children in their city schools. At that time the board of education of the city came forward with a program that would cost \$17,000,000 for school buildings. There was grave doubt upon the part of thoughtful people of the need for expenditure of so large a sum.

A bond issue was proposed and it was voted down by the people of the city. A year or so later it was proposed again, and again it was voted down. The friends of education of children in Portland called upon the Bureau of Education to make a study. A study was made—a careful survey—by a specialist, who reported to the board. A new plan was adopted upon the basis of this report and that would care for every child it was proposed be cared for under the \$17,000,000 plan, at a cost of \$11,000,000 to the city. Again a vote was had upon issuing bonds to carry forward the project, and the project was approved. This piece of work alone of the Bureau of Education saved the city of Portland \$6,000,000.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I yield.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. The office of education in the city of Youngstown called upon the Bureau of Education to make a survey about two years ago and they went into the question very thoroughly, and upon the recommendation of the bureau they reorganized their board of education and their school system and it has been the means of saving thousands of dollars to the taxpayers of our community.

Mr. FRENCH. The same experience has occurred in other cities. Only recently there has been completed a study of the schools of 74 cities, where a demand existed for more school buildings. Through the agency of the Bureau of Education a study was made of those 74 cities and recommendations adopted under which 10,000 children will be accommodated without the building of a single additional room, but through rearrangement and better use of present facilities. The Bureau of Education, in these and other matters, ought to have the opportunity of giving the public at large the benefit of the valuable work performed. The amendment ought to prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will again report the amendment for information.

The Clerk again reported the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLLINS) there were ayes 41 and noes 21.

So the amendment was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the second amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRENCH: Page 5, line 22, strike out "\$20,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$40,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary traveling expenses of the commissioner and employees acting under his direction, including attendance at meetings of educational associations, societies, and other organizations; for compensation, not to exceed \$500, of employees in field service; for purchase, distribution, and exchange of educational documents, motion-picture films, and lantern slides; collection, exchange, and cataloguing of educational apparatus and appliances, articles of school furniture and models of school buildings illustrative of foreign and domestic systems and methods of education, and repairing the same; and other expenses not herein provided for, \$20,000.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HASTINGS: Page 87, after line 25, insert the following: "The unexpired balance of the appropriation for the investigation of teacher training, contained in the Interior Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1933 shall remain available for the fiscal year 1934 for the purpose of editing and printing the reports prepared under provisions of those appropriations, including the payment of salaries in the District of Columbia and elsewhere."

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment to ask the gentleman a question. How much is in that fund?

Mr. HASTINGS. This is simply a continuance of the unexpired balance from this year until next year. The Bureau of Education thought that would be expended between now and June 30, but for fear it would not be, this authorizes it to be carried over into the next fiscal year and makes no additional appropriation. It will amount to about \$12,000 or \$15,000.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I intended to offer at the conclusion of the Geological Survey paragraph. It should have come immediately after the last of the Geological Survey items, and I ask unanimous consent to return to page 74, line 9, in order to offer the amendment just after line 9, where it should have been offered. By mistake it was noted as coming under the items in relation to the government of the Territories and Alaska, and not under the Geological Survey.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I very much regret, but we are opposed to the amendment, and I would have to oppose it, but if the gentleman wishes, I will reserve the objection so that the gentleman can make a statement.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of the appropriation bill the committee has dropped the item of appropriation for the investigation of mineral resources in the Territory of Alaska.

For many years we have had a small group of geologists who have been engaged in making mineral investigations in the Territory of Alaska. That group of men has been interested there for over 20 years and has performed most excellent work in organizing the mineral industry there. They have been doing an immense amount of good work during that period in investigating the geological and mineral resources of Alaska and have been of inestimable value to us in the development of gold and other minerals in the Territory of Alaska. That appropriation is now dropped from this bill, though it was carried in that of the last session. That little bureau of five or six geologists and three or four topographic men has been destroyed. These men, so familiar with Alaska work, are dropped entirely. Without any notice to me or any of the people interested in the item, it was dropped, though no intimation was given

to us in the hearings that the committee contemplated any such drastic action.

The testimony in respect to that matter was taken by the committee on the 22d day of November, two weeks before Congress met. It was printed, and the bill was introduced on the 15th day of December. Nobody knew what was in the bill until it was introduced last week and taken up for reading on the next morning. There was nothing in the evidence taken before the committee to intimate that this work would be stopped. It is of inestimable value to the development of mining in our Territory. You could take almost any other item out of the appropriation for Alaska with less harm to the Territory than this, Mr. Chairman.

We took out between \$5,000,000 and \$6,000,000 in gold in 1927. It has increased a million dollars every year from that time to this. Last year we took out \$9,500,000 of gold. This year we will take out probably \$10,000,000. The output of gold is increasing in Alaska every year, and this little group of nine men who have never had more than \$60,000 for their support has been the backbone of the development of the gold resources of Alaska for the last 20 years. It is a damage to you, it is a damage to the whole country to have this work stopped, and I am disappointed that we did not have any opportunity to consider the matter. It is a damage not only with respect to Alaska but to the general country. We are doing an increasing work there in gold mining, and we need the support of these men in developing, organizing, and coordinating the work. They do prospecting, surveying, they give instructions and advice to these men in the Territory who are taking out the gold and other minerals, and it is of great aid to our miners and prospectors. It is important to you; it is important to every man who wants the gold resources of this country developed and the gold mined and put into the general system of finance.

We have taken out more than \$410,000,000 in gold alone in the Territory of Alaska. We are increasing the output every year and we need these men to aid the miners and prospectors and to assist us in the development of the gold resources of Alaska.

Accidentally this proposed amendment was cited in the wrong place. It was my fault, and I ask now that we may return to the items under the Geological Survey, where it belongs. It is only for \$30,000. Thirty thousand dollars is only one-third of 1 per cent of the output of gold in Alaska for the last year. It is the smallest tax anybody could possibly pay for the development of these great resources—and they are your resources—and this money goes into your financial system. You ought not to take this small appropriation away from Alaska. It is a mistake to do so. These geologists are first-class men in their field of work. They are doing a great amount of work there and they ought to be allowed to go ahead with it. They have been doing it for 20 years to the great profit of the Territory of Alaska and to the great profit of the mineral development of that Territory that you need so much. So I hope the House will let us return to the Geological Survey items, where this one belongs, and permit my Territory to have the benefit of this small appropriation which is so beneficial to the development of its mineral resources.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, the members of the subcommittee who framed this bill do not want to do anything to retard the development of Alaska, but the subcommittee does not think that the cutting out of this amendment will do that. They will continue to do the mining development in Alaska this next year just as they have in the past. The mining up around Fairbanks and Juneau will be carried on just exactly the same as it has been this year. These are the reasons why I object to returning to that portion of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

For defraying the deficits in the treasuries of the municipal governments because of the excess of current expenses over current revenues for the fiscal year 1934, municipality of St. Thomas and St. John, \$105,000, and municipality of St. Croix, \$105,000; in all, \$210,000: *Provided*, That the amount herein appropriated for each municipal government shall be expended only if an equivalent amount is raised by municipal revenues and applied to

the operating costs of the respective government, except that for the fiscal year 1934 the contribution to either municipal government shall not be less than \$100,000: *Provided further*, That should the revenues of the municipality of St. Thomas and St. John, during the fiscal year 1934, exceed \$105,000, and/or the revenues of the municipality of St. Croix exceed \$105,000, such excess revenues may be expended for municipal improvements and operating costs of the municipalities under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe.

Mr. GOSS. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question. In the proviso why was it stated that the contribution to either municipal government shall not be less than \$100,000? And does the gentleman know that that figure is the minimum, provided rigid economy were exercised?

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, may I say that the Government of the United States has a certain very definite responsibility in the islands. It requires much more to carry forward the share on what was supposed to be a 50-50 basis than \$100,000. We thought we would fix that as a minimum so that we could, if possible, encourage the islands to themselves come forward with as much money as we could obtain from them for the administration of the government. So we felt we were justified in including a minimum of \$100,000.

Mr. GOSS. Of course, the gentleman knows their most famous product has been dispensed with by the prohibition act, that is, St. Croix rum. That was the big product of that island, and since that time I suppose that has actually increased our contribution toward the running of their government.

Mr. FRENCH. Of course, the gentleman will recall that we acquired the islands about 1916 or 1917 and that the greatest resource of the island of St. Thomas at that time was—

Mr. GOSS. The one I was talking about is St. Croix.

Mr. FRENCH. Well, there the greatest resource was sugar, and in St. Thomas the greatest resource was income derived by inhabitants of the island working in connection with the shipping business. At that time we had coal centers there. It was a great coal fueling station for many ships.

Mr. GOSS. The gentleman assures us, then, that this \$100,000 is not in any way a wasteful expense, when the minimum is fixed at \$100,000?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes; I believe it is absolutely essential to do the work and carry the responsibility that our Government has assumed.

The Clerk read as follows:

For such projects for the further development of agriculture and industry, and for promoting the general welfare of the islands as may be approved by the President, including the acquisition by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of land and the construction of buildings for use in administering the affairs of the islands; the purchase of land for sale as homesteads to citizens of the Virgin Islands; and the making of loans for the construction of buildings, for the purchase of farming implements and equipment, and for other expenses incident to the cultivation of land purchased for resale as homesteads, \$15,000, and in addition thereto the unexpended balance of the appropriation for the temporary government for the Virgin Islands contained in the Interior Department appropriation act, fiscal year 1933.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this paragraph has to do with the agriculture of the Virgin Islands and the general improvement of conditions there. I have asked for just this brief moment to insert some matter in the Record at this point, and for that reason I ask unanimous consent at this time to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KETCHAM. This is a brief statement concerning the proposition now before the Committee on Agriculture, presented thereto by the farm organizations of the country in the way of farm-relief organizations. A good many Members of the House have made some inquiry of me concerning its provisions, and in response to these questions

from a considerable number of Members I have taken the time to write out a very brief statement which I think will present to you in just a moment's reading the essentials of the proposition as it has been presented by the farm organizations. I may say it is a bit different from those presented heretofore, in that a different yardstick than we have heretofore had for these farm-relief proposals is introduced in this measure.

I shall not take time to refer to it at this time, more than to call your attention to the details of the plan as they are worked out in a very brief statement, which I have just obtained permission to extend at this particular moment.

I yield back, Mr. Chairman, the balance of my time.

The matter referred to follows:

FARM-RELIEF PROPOSAL OF THE FARM ORGANIZATIONS

Students of the farm problem in the United States emphasize three major proposals to aid agricultural recovery.

First, better prices for farm products; second, readjustment of farm-mortgage indebtedness, and third, reduction of taxes.

These three proposals have been the subject of special consideration at recent national meetings of the leading farm organizations, and the theme of wide editorial and congressional discussion in the order named: Better farm prices, both actual and relative, is believed by many to be the first essential to economic recovery for all our people. The farm-mortgage problem is critical but does not affect all sections, nor all farmers, as does the low price for farm products. Taxation on farms is almost entirely a State and local matter. Furthermore, better farm prices would help immediately and effectively toward improving both the mortgage and tax situations.

For the first time since farm-relief legislation has been under consideration by Congress the farm organizations have agreed upon a legislative plan to improve farm prices on four principal farm products, and have just outlined their proposal before the House Committee on Agriculture. Because of the widespread interest in the improvement of the farm economic situation, I felt it would be of unusual interest to the members of the committee to sketch the plan briefly.

The purpose of the plan is to reduce production and thus avoid the surpluses that have been so ruinous to farm prices. To encourage farmers to reduce acreage of crops and tonnage of hogs, the bill provides for a tax to be levied upon the first processing of such commodity. The proceeds of this tax will be paid to farmers who make the required reductions. The form of such payment will be an adjustment certificate. Its value will be the difference between the market value of the particular commodity and the fair exchange value. By "fair exchange value" is meant the average value of the commodity for the years 1909-1914, when farm prices were on a parity with other commodity prices.

Wheat, cotton, hogs, and tobacco are the products included in the bill. It is limited to these four crops because the prices on them are claimed to control other farm prices, because they have exportable surpluses and are therefore in competition with the lower world markets, and finally because they are practically all processed, thereby affording the opportunity to levy a tax on first processors.

The average farm price for average grades of these products on November 1, 1932, was as follows: Wheat, 32.8 cents per bushel; cotton, 5.1 cents per pound; hogs, 3.05 cents per pound; and tobacco, 8.9 cents per pound. The fair exchange value prices proposed for the marketing period of each crop for 1933 are: Wheat, 93.7 cents per bushel; cotton, 13.7 cents per pound; hogs, 7.67 cents per pound; tobacco, 11 cents per pound.

Taking the November market price of wheat of 32.8 cents as the year's average and comparing it with the bill's fair exchange value of 93.7 cents, farmers are to be paid practically 61 cents per bushel premium. Only such farmers as reduced their wheat acreage 20 per cent in 1931 and agree to the necessary 1933 quota acreage reduction, can qualify for the 61-cent premium. Furthermore, they would receive such premiums on about 75 per cent of this crop, their quota of the average American consumption of wheat.

If a farmer meeting the above conditions had 100 bushels of wheat to sell, he would receive \$32.80 cash at the time of sale and a so-called adjustment certificate for \$45.75—seventy-five times 61 cents. This certificate will be an obligation of the United States, transferrable and payable in two installments during the marketing year.

As acreage and tonnage is reduced, the market price will rise. The adjustment charge is determined and proclaimed at the opening of the marketing period by the Secretary of Agriculture. Obviously, this charge will decrease as the market price approaches the fair exchange value, or parity price, as it is ordinarily called. The plan involves no charge upon the Treasury and the expense of administration will be limited to 2½ per cent of the adjustment charges.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

For support, clothing, and treatment in St. Elizabeths Hospital for the insane of insane persons from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, insane inmates of the National Home for

Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, persons charged with or convicted of crimes against the United States who are insane, all persons who have become insane since their entry into the military and naval service of the United States, insane civilians in the quartermaster service of the Army, insane persons transferred from the Canal Zone who have been admitted to the hospital and who are indigent, American citizens legally adjudged insane in the Dominion of Canada whose legal residence in one of the States, Territories, or the District of Columbia it has been impossible to establish, insane beneficiaries of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, and insane beneficiaries of the United States Veterans' Administration, including not exceeding \$27,000 for the purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent, purchasing agent, and general hospital business, and including not to exceed \$200,000 for repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds, \$1,116,700, including maintenance and operation of necessary facilities for feeding employees and others (at not less than cost), and the proceeds therefrom shall reimburse the appropriation for the institution; and not exceeding \$1,500 of this sum may be expended in the removal of patients to their friends, not exceeding \$1,500 in the purchase of such books, periodicals, and newspapers, as may be required for the purposes of the hospital and for the medical library, and not exceeding \$1,500 for the actual and necessary expenses incurred in the apprehension and return to the hospital of escaped patients: *Provided*, That so much of this sum as may be required shall be available for all necessary expenses in ascertaining the residence of inmates who are not or who cease to be properly chargeable to Federal maintenance in the institution and in returning them to such places of residence: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of oleomargarine or butter substitutes except for cooking purposes: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year 1934 the District of Columbia, or any branch of the Government requiring St. Elizabeths Hospital to care for patients for which they are responsible, shall pay by check to the superintendent, upon his written request, either in advance or at the end of each month, all or part of the estimated or actual cost of such maintenance, as the case may be, and bills rendered by the superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital in accordance herewith shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; proper adjustments on the basis of the actual cost of the care of patients paid for in advance shall be made monthly or quarterly, as may be agreed upon between the superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital and the District of Columbia government, department, or establishments concerned. All sums paid to the superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital for the care of patients that he is authorized by law to receive shall be deposited to the credit on the books of the Treasury Department of the appropriation made for the care and maintenance of the patients at St. Elizabeths Hospital for the year in which the support, clothing, and treatment is provided, and be subject to requisition by the disbursing agent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, upon the approval of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That there shall be available for replacement of boilers and remodeling of the power plant, including preparation of plans and specifications, advertising for proposals, and not to exceed \$11,000 for necessary traveling expenses and personal services without reference to the classification act of 1923, as amended, or civil-service rules and regulations, \$250,000, from funds accrued, or which may accrue, prior to July 1, 1934, under the act approved February 2, 1909 (U. S. C., title 24, sec. 165), such portions of funds as have accrued under said act to be immediately available for this use.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the proviso. I notice that in the permanent appropriations the appropriation is jumped from \$80,000 to \$295,000, and I understand from talking with the members of the committee that this \$250,000 comes out of that fund. Is that correct?

Mr. HASTINGS. I did not hear the inquiry of the gentleman.

Mr. GOSS. In the indefinite and permanent appropriation this item has been raised from \$80,000 to \$295,000, and I understand from conversation with the gentleman that the \$250,000 in this proviso comes out of the fund accrued under this law. The law is cited here as the United States Code, title 24, and refers to pensions only. I am wondering why the pensions jumped from \$80,000 to \$295,000.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman is confused with regard to the expenditure of this money.

Mr. GOSS. I just got that explanation.

Mr. FRENCH. I think the gentleman refers in his inquiry now to moneys that are carried in the permanent and indefinite appropriation.

Mr. GOSS. Yes; that is correct. This proviso states in line 6 that \$250,000 is applicable to these repairs from funds accrued or which may accrue prior to July 1 under this act, and the act, as the gentleman knows, is an act that refers only to pensions. How can you take into an indefinite appropriation which has been made law funds which are for pensions and use them to repair boilers, and so forth?

Mr. FRENCH. The general law to which the gentleman refers provides that when those who are drawing pensions are sent to St. Elizabeths the disbursing officer of the institution is made the custodian of the funds of such person.

Mr. GOSS. To be expended in an amount not to exceed what he has to his credit.

Mr. FRENCH. If the gentleman will permit me to follow up, I do not have the law before me, but I can quote it essentially from memory.

Mr. GOSS. I have it right here.

Mr. FRENCH. The law provides not only that the moneys shall be expended for the use of the individual but that the moneys upon the death of the individual may be allocated in a certain way to certain immediate relatives, and then, when certain requirements of the law shall have been complied with, any balance shall go to the institution itself.

Mr. GOSS. So that when we passed that permanent law, which provided a pension for the individuals that transferred or came there from the Army, Navy, or the District of Columbia, that fund was supposed to be used for the comfort and use of the individual patients alone. This is the provision of the original act as I read it.

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. Now, the Appropriations Committee comes along in this proviso and provides for taking out of funds already accumulated or which may accrue up until July 1, 1934, money to replace boilers or to remodel the power plant, or that sort of thing, which seems to me to be definitely legislation that was not intended in the original act with respect to the accruing of pensions to the individual, and this is what I want to have explained.

Mr. FRENCH. No; not at all. The moneys would not be deducted from the compensation or pension due to a living person, but there are certain balances that finally go to the institution after the requirements of the law have been complied with. The law itself says, after providing for the distribution of moneys upon the death of a person in the institution who was drawing a pension, that any further balance to his or her credit shall be applied to the general uses of the hospital. So we are not appropriating money or providing for the use of money of living persons. These are in the nature of remnants of estates left by inmates of the institution, the remnants going to the support and general maintenance of the institution, under the law that the Congress itself passed nearly 30 years ago.

Mr. GOSS. Then, on that basis, out of the \$295,000 carried in the indefinite appropriation, you would expect to spend upward of \$250,000 for improvements, which would cut the actual pension money received by the inmates by \$40,000 next year?

Mr. FRENCH. No; the moneys received by those inmates who are living would not be cut at all.

Mr. GOSS. I refer the gentleman to the indefinite appropriation raised from \$80,000 to \$295,000. If you use \$250,000 of that fund that would cut the original pensions by \$40,000.

Mr. FRENCH. No; let me turn back a little. The total amount of money that is now in the fund is not \$295,000 but \$600,000. This represents accumulations of a good many years. Of that amount the bill provides \$250,000 for the power plant. In addition to this the institution has estimated it would use \$45,000 for purposes authorized in the law.

Mr. GOSS. You have less patients than you had a year ago.

Mr. FRENCH. No; somewhat more.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses: For equipment, supplies, apparatus, furniture, cases and shelving, stationery, ice, repairs to buildings and grounds, and for other necessary expenses, including reimbursement to the appropriation for Freedmen's Hospital of actual cost of heat and light furnished, \$220,000.

Mr. DE PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 98, line 12, after the figures "\$220,000," add the following: "For construction and completion of a heating, lighting, and power plant for Howard University, \$460,000, to be immediately available."

Mr. DE PRIEST. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I would not present this if it was not an absolute emergency. Howard University is completing two new buildings now, and they will be finished some time this summer.

The present heating plant is antiquated and obsolete. It is overloaded about 40 or 50 per cent during this cold weather. It is only a 100-horsepower plant, and it is unable to do the required work.

The Bureau of the Budget put in \$460,000 to be immediately available, but the Bureau of the Budget afterward decided to withdraw its support in favor of the sum in this present appropriation bill. They did that for the sake of economy.

While I agree that we should exercise economy in every possible way that we can, it must be remembered that if this present plant breaks down that institution will be without heat and light and without power. The hospital would be without its heat and light; you might get light in an emergency, but it is impossible to get heat.

The university is spending \$225,000 to build a distributing tunnel. That tunnel will soon be completed to the site of the new proposed power plant.

I ask you gentlemen and ladies not to close this institution on a plea of economy. Howard University is the only great educational institution in this country for our group.

We ask you, since this emergency has existed and since it was once reported by the Bureau of the Budget, to give Howard University an appropriation of \$460,000 for the express purpose of building this heat, light, and power plant.

These figures were sent over from the Bureau of Mines as late as last November. The Bureau of Mines checked the figures of the committee as to light, heat, and power, and they claim it will take \$460,000 to do the work. They ought to know, for they are the experts for Congress. Some Members thought it might be done for less, but I do not think any member of the committee will say that this is not an emergency.

He will say that he does not think the Government is able to do that under this economy program, and that we must pay something; but there are some things where we can not afford to practice economy, when it is liable to shut down such an institution as Howard University or Freedmen's Hospital. Freedmen's Hospital is the only public hospital in the city of Washington where the people of my group go. We do not happen to be as favored as the rest of you, because limitations are prescribed. I appeal to you all not to make it possible that there will be no place where the sick and the wounded of my group may be sheltered. [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. All the members of the Interior Department appropriation subcommittee have a very kindly feeling toward Howard University. We all thoroughly appreciate its importance and the great work it is doing, and during the past few years we have made very large appropriations for it. There is no question but that the university will have to have a new heating plant some time in the near future. Last year we recommended an appropriation of \$300,000 for that purpose. But this matter was fully presented to the Bureau of the Budget this year, and that bureau declined to recommend an appropriation for that purpose in this bill. We have not put a single item in this entire bill from beginning to end that has not been recommended by the Budget, with the approval of the President of the United States. The committee has been following this policy of economy, and we felt when the Budget made no recommendation after a thorough investigation of this matter this past summer, that the committee was safe in following the Budget and leaving it out as we did. The Budget evidently did look upon this matter as urgent. Furthermore, I may say that as chairman of this subcommittee,

I have been approached at various times by the friends of the university, including the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DE PRIEST] and that we have in very friendly way considered the matter.

I have said to them that this estimate of \$460,000 was first made a year or two or three years ago, and that if a suitable heating plant could be built at that time for that amount that certainly, with reduction in the cost of everything, we felt—and we so reported a year ago—that \$300,000 was amply sufficient to build a suitable plant; and if \$300,000 was enough a year ago, less than that amount would be sufficient now. I felt then—and I feel now—that these people, including the gentleman from Illinois, should have gone before the Bureau of the Budget and obtained a supplemental estimate from the Budget and should have brought it before this committee or before the main committee or before this House. They have declined to do so. There was no formal request made before to the subcommittee for this item. There was no presentation of the matter. When the Budget eliminated it, and when nobody came before our subcommittee with a supplemental estimate for it; when there is no showing that there is an emergency at this time, we felt that we ought not to open the gate and put in an item of \$460,000 to build a plant that the Bureau of the Budget would not say was emergent; and your committee does not think it is emergent.

We feel that if it was really urgent, the Budget would have said so, and, because they did not and do not now recommend it, we think it can safely go over until next fall or some other future time when it can be taken up in an intelligent and systematic way. It can be presented to a deficiency appropriations committee at any time. In other words, these gentlemen who are so solicitous about Howard University ought to present the urgency of it to the Budget itself and get the approval of the Budget and not insist on forcing it on the House of Representatives without any showing or supplemental estimate or approval by the administration.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Has the gentleman taken the two new buildings into consideration and when they are to be completed?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. They are going to be completed within the next year?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; I think so.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. And how are they going to be able to run them without heat?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. All these matters were presented to and considered by the Budget, and the Budget has decided that there will be no harm done in putting this over until next year some time when Congress has an opportunity to make the necessary investigations and appropriate whatever amount is necessary.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Would the gentleman's committee be willing to consider those two buildings and let the appropriation come in on that account at this time?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I said to these gentlemen a few days ago that if they would present this matter to the Budget and obtain a supplemental estimate from the Budget the committee would consider it. But they seem unwilling to go before that bureau or present the matter in a business-like way and they have declined to come before us and make a showing of any kind. In these desperate financial times our committee is unwilling to make appropriations that way.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. It seems to me that we ought to be reasonable. The gentleman admits they are going to have these two buildings completed, and I think we ought to appropriate enough money to heat them. I think we ought to consider it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. My thought is that Congress has no right to appropriate a half million dollars without

any showing or hearing before any committee or Budget recommendations or anything to base it on. It is utterly unbusinesslike. No one can justify making appropriations this way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the committee, a good part of my constituency are vitally interested in the fine work that Howard University is doing for the colored race.

Furthermore, that constituency deeply appreciates the aid and assistance given to Howard University by the Federal Government. That constituency has no quarrel whatever with the committees of this House for failing to provide in this bill for the construction of a new power plant. The fault lies directly with the Bureau of the Budget. They originally recommended \$460,000 for the beginning of work and the completion of the new power plant, and then withdrew their recommendation, for what reason no one knows. That is where the fault lies. Wherever the fault may lie, the fact remains that next fall, two buildings, the educational building and the chemistry building, will have been completed, and the present power plant is wholly inadequate to provide heat, light, and power. Now we are faced with an absolute fact, admitted by the subcommittee of this House and by the records of the Bureau of Mines. What are we going to do about it? Are we going to have two buildings, completed, without heat, light, and power? There is something else we can do about it. We can go out and purchase the power necessary, but that is not economy. So I urge the Members of this House that now is the time to start work on this power plant so it will be completed by the time these two buildings, the educational building and the chemistry building, are completed.

I sincerely hope that this House to-day will approve of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DE PRIEST].

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Let us see what the situation is with reference to the amendment. In the first place, permit me to say that neither did the subcommittee nor the full committee allow a single item in any bureau in the entire bill that was not estimated for by the Bureau of the Budget. I grant that improvements are asked for all over the country in connection with all kinds of schools, but the committee did not recommend a single item anywhere that was not recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Now, is that not the safe thing to follow?

Mr. MOUSER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HASTINGS. No; I do not have time to yield now.

There was not a single item, not one in my State, not one in the whole United States, that was allowed, that was not recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, nor did we increase a single item.

Here is an item of \$460,000. That is a very sizable item. That is a very large amount of money. We have tried to economize in every way. I want to call attention to the fact that Howard University is not a Government school. That must be kept in mind. This is not a Government institution. It is not a Government school. It is not incumbent upon the Government of the United States to pay the entire expenses of Howard University. It is true we contribute to it. It is purely an act of grace. I want to ask if we have not made a pretty fair contribution to this school? In this bill we contribute \$632,500 toward Howard University. That is a fair contribution by the Federal Government to an institution that is not a Government institution. I ask you what would any one of you say about a member of this committee,

when we are trying in every possible way to economize, if we had come here and recommended \$460,000 that was not recommended by the Bureau of the Budget? You know we would have been criticized by every Member of the House. We would have been turned down by the full committee, and we would not have been justified in making the recommendation.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER. The gentleman states that there were not any items favorably reported by his committee that were not reported by the Bureau of the Budget. Is it not a fact that the Bureau of the Budget did not recommend an estimate of \$250,000 to increase the heating-plant capacity at St. Elizabeths Hospital?

Mr. HASTINGS. Oh, that was done by the Bureau of the Budget. They estimated for it. I repeat now to Members on both sides of the Chamber that there is not an item recommended by this committee in this bill that was not estimated for by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is there any substantial evidence, either before the gentleman's committee or otherwise, that this is, as a matter of fact, an emergency situation?

Mr. HASTINGS. In answer to the gentleman, it was only casually suggested before the committee.

Mr. MOUSER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I only have five minutes. I want to answer the gentleman from Alabama.

It was not considered by the subcommittee when the Howard University items were presented and when we allowed the \$632,500. There was some reference to it, but the committee did not consider it at all, and there was not any estimate furnished.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

I read from the RECORD a letter addressed to Albert I. Cassell, architect for Howard University, signed by Scott Turner, of the Bureau of Mines, in which he says:

Your letter dated Washington, D. C., November 29, regarding statements and calculations covering the proposed power plant for Howard University and Freedmen's Hospital, has been received.

The Bureau of Mines has checked the various surveys made and has arrived at \$460,000 as the minimum sum required at this time for a power plant. It is considered that an emergency need is involved; at least \$40,000 would be needed to change over the group of buildings to be able to use alternating current; a study of the calculations submitted shows them to be essentially correct.

Yours faithfully,

SCOTT TURNER, Director.

That letter was written on November 30, 1932.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. They made the same report a year ago.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. That is all right. But the gentleman in his statement said that he wanted them to go back to the Budget. This letter is less than three weeks old.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. But that was furnished to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DE PRIEST] and not to our committee.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. But the statement is right here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The gentleman could have read it. Now, what is the use quibbling over something that is a necessity?

We all know what Howard University is. If you are going to stop Howard University, bring in a resolution to stop it; but if you are going to continue it as a hospital, then provide sufficient funds for its operation.

Mr. HASTINGS. It is not a Government school; we do not pay all the expenses of Howard University.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I will admit all the gentleman says, but if you are going to stop Howard University, stop

it. If you are going to keep Howard University running, do not cripple it, but put in the heating plant that is required.

Mr. MOUSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I yield.

Mr. MOUSER. As a matter of fact, the Government has recognized it at least as a quasi-governmental institution, because it has been the practice to appropriate money to give poor colored boys an opportunity for an education.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Certainly; we all know that. There is not any Member in this House, be he Democrat or Republican, but who wants to see Howard University continue. That being so, why cripple it now by refusing to appropriate for this heating plant this year? It will be in the bill again next year if we do not provide for it now.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does not the gentleman think that \$632,500 is a generous contribution toward Howard University for the present?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I will admit it is a good, big item; but when we are putting out money for other things, why not put it out also for this heating plant which is so necessary? I tell you again, right now, if you do not do it now, you will have to do it next year, and you will probably find it harder to do next year than you find it now, and what do you want to let it go over for?

I think this ought to go through. I am earnest about it. I am not trying here to secure something I do not think is right, and I am not doing it because of the colored people. I am doing it because this is an institution Congress has been helping for the last 10 years I have been in Congress. Why do you want to destroy it? Why not pass this emergency appropriation of \$460,000? The money will not all be spent at once; you are simply authorizing the appropriation and they will use the money as they need it.

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I yield.

Mr. GAVAGAN. I think the gentleman wants to be fair and I know the gentleman is usually very fair in his statements, but when he says we want to destroy it, or when he asks why do we wish to destroy it—

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. You will destroy it if you do not heat it.

Mr. GAVAGAN. Does not the gentleman think the Bureau of the Budget could have found that out?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I am not running the Bureau of the Budget. I am in Congress. So is the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GAVAGAN. I do not want the gentleman's remarks to be interpreted in the least that this House rejected or attempted to strike out from the appropriation bill that item.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I did not say that. I said we have tried to carry this thing along and why destroy it? That is what I said. I did not say, "We are going to destroy it." I said, "Why destroy it?"

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER. Our Democratic colleague is trying to place responsibility upon the Bureau of the Budget for political purposes instead of placing it upon Congress; and if this heating plant fails, the responsibility will not be placed upon the Director of the Budget but upon the Democratic majority.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I think the members of the Democratic Party are as much in favor of it as I am. I know they are.

Mr. MOUSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

As a matter of fact, this is the only institution helping colored people in the United States with governmental assistance. This institution trains colored men and women for the professions to administer among their own race. This institution turns out doctors, lawyers, engineers, dentists, and other professional men. This Congress is spending several hundred thousands of dollars for new buildings.

I say to you it is the falsest kind of economy to permit new structures intended to meet the needs of the rapidly growing population of this university because of the interest of colored people in enlightenment and education to permit these buildings to be unoccupied under the guise of economy and stop these men and women from getting learning in the professions to administer among their own people.

Mr. Chairman, if this money for the power plant is not appropriated, a considerable investment will necessarily have to lie idle. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DE PRIEST] put in a letter from the power company of Washington advising us that the Government could manufacture power cheaper for that school than they as a public utility could furnish it. It is only in the interest of good public business to appropriate \$460,000 for a power plant to light and heat those new buildings. Otherwise you are leaving them vacant.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, this is an absolutely simple proposition that confronts us. We are asked here to appropriate \$460,000 out of the Public Treasury, without an estimate from the President or the Director of the Budget or without one line of testimony before the committee which considered this appropriation bill. There has not been a particle of testimony presented to the Committee on Appropriations showing why this \$460,000 should be appropriated at this time.

I am not here to attach responsibility to anyone; but I submit that if any responsibility attaches at the outset, and if anybody is responsible for failure to get this matter properly before the committee and before the Congress, that responsibility rests with the President of the United States and the Director of the Budget, who failed to include it in their estimates, and I assume for a perfectly good reason because I am not here criticizing them. I assume they did it after a thorough investigation because they felt that in the interest of economy it was not necessary to carry it in the appropriations for this year. There could be no other assumption. If it had been necessary, or if the investigations of the Director of the Budget had shown that they needed this central heating plant to be appropriated for in this bill, do you not know that the President of the United States and the Director of the Budget would have sent it up here and said that we ought to appropriate the money?

We have not made appropriations here that have not been estimated for. Why are you asked to make an exception in this instance and do it, as I say, without the slightest evidence from anybody who is officially responsible for presenting the evidence to you and to me, and vote \$460,000 out of the Treasury of the people? Those who vote for it will do so for purely political purposes, and it will be so recognized by the people.

I am astounded at the position some of my friends have taken with reference to this particular appropriation. What are the facts? How do you and I know that it is going to take \$460,000 to put up this central heating plant? The gentleman from Colorado told you that several years ago they said it would cost \$460,000. You know that the cost of material has gone down considerably; and if you are going to build a central heating plant or if the Director of the Budget and the President had thought it necessary, do you not know it could be done for much less than the estimates that were submitted a year ago?

We are spending millions of dollars on a central heating plant here in the city of Washington. I do not know and I am not going to tell you or even intimate that it can be done, but we are building a large heating plant; and how do you and I know but that there will be a way devised whereby heat can be furnished to the university from this heating plant, just as we are undertaking to furnish it to the Pan American Union Building in a bill which passed here a few days ago.

So I say, let us not be driven off our feet by a proposition of this sort. This university can survive and furnish itself with heat for another year. Let us have a little time to look into this, and let us have somebody come before us

with authority and with information who can tell us whether or not it is necessary. I hope the amendment will not be adopted. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DE PRIEST) there were—ayes 35, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. Appropriations herein made for field work under the General Land Office, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Geological Survey, and the National Park Service shall be available for the hire, with or without personal services, of work animals and animal-drawn and motor-propelled vehicles and equipment.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes the reading of the bill. I shall detain the committee only a moment to get a little information and call the attention of the House and some of the departments to a situation which I understand exists in some of them.

The House will recall that the economy bill carries a provision authorizing the departments and various independent activities of the Government to transfer from one appropriation to another within the department or independent establishment, 12 per cent of the amount of the appropriation. Of course, Congress, in making this provision, intended that this sum should be used so as to avoid any possible deficiency, in view of the very heavy reductions that were being made in many of the appropriations last year. I dare say it was never intended—I know it was never intended—that where Congress had made a specific appropriation for salaries and for clerical service in these various activities, that any head of department or any chief of bureau should undertake to transfer from some other fund in his department, for instance, a lump-sum appropriation for construction 12 per cent or any other amount under 12 per cent in order to frustrate the will of Congress and provide more money for salaries and clerical expenses than Congress had originally appropriated.

In the hearings on the Post Office and Treasury bill the subcommittee, as members of the subcommittee who are here now will recall, went into the matter with every bureau, and I can say that I think this was not done in any one of those two departments. We found no evidence of any such transfer.

I have had my attention called to the fact that in the War Department transfers have been made, if I remember correctly, to the War College from lump-sum appropriations made for War Department purposes in order to keep a force there that Congress had cut out and did not intend should be kept during this year.

This is one instance that has been called to my attention, and I want to ask the gentlemen in charge of this bill whether or not in their investigations with reference to the Interior Department they found any similar occurrences?

Mr. HASTINGS. If the gentleman from Tennessee will permit, I will say we did, and I invite the gentleman's attention and also the attention of the members of the committee to the statement on pages 7 and 8 of the hearings showing such transfers.

There was a transfer from the National Park Service for roads and trails in the national parks of four items totaling \$150,000. There was a further transfer from the roads and trails in national parks to salaries of the Office of Education, \$30,000. There was a transfer from the roads and trails appropriation for national parks to the Geological Survey, \$284,400. There was a transfer from certain items within the Bureau of Indian Affairs of various items shown on page 8 totaling \$241,700.

The total of all these transfers, according to the statement furnished the subcommittee, aggregates \$706,100. With the permission of the House, I will insert the details of these estimates in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The table is as follows:

Transfers between appropriations of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1933 under the provisions of section 317 of the legislative act of June 30, 1932

From—	To—	Amount
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE		
Roads and trails, national parks.....	GENERAL LAND OFFICE	
Do.....	Surveying the public lands, 1933.	\$75,000
Do.....	Protecting public lands, timber, etc., 1933.	60,000
Do.....	Contingent expenses of land offices, 1933.	10,000
Do.....	Salaries, General Land Office, 1933.	5,000
Total.....		150,000
OFFICE OF EDUCATION		
Roads and trails, national parks.....	Salaries, Office of Education, 1933.	30,000
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY		
Do.....	U. S. Geological Survey, 1933 (salaries, Geological Survey).	18,750
Do.....	U. S. Geological Survey, 1933 (topographic surveys).	38,400
Do.....	U. S. Geological Survey, 1933 (geological surveys in the United States).	48,750
Do.....	U. S. Geological Survey, 1933 (fundamental research in geologic science).	6,000
Do.....	U. S. Geological Survey, 1933 (volcanologic surveys).	2,250
Do.....	U. S. Geological Survey, 1933 (mineral resources of Alaska).	9,000
Do.....	U. S. Geological Survey, 1933 (gaging streams).	75,000
Do.....	U. S. Geological Survey, 1933 (classification of lands).	15,000
Do.....	U. S. Geological Survey, 1933 (printing and binding).	18,000
Do.....	U. S. Geological Survey, 1933 (preparation of illustrations).	3,000
Do.....	U. S. Geological Survey, 1933 (engraving and printing geologic and topographic maps).	16,500
Do.....	U. S. Geological Survey, 1933 (mineral leasing).	33,750
Total.....		284,400
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS		
Improvements, Fort Hall irrigation project, Idaho, reimbursement, 1932-33.	BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS	
Indian school buildings, 1932-33 (new construction).	Salaries, Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1933.	15,000
Indian school buildings, 1933 (repairs and improvements).	do.....	7,500
Conservation of health among Indians, 1931-1933 (Pierre, S. Dak., sanatorium and employees' quarters, construction and equipment).	do.....	7,500
Conservation of health among Indians, 1931-1933 (Albuquerque, N. Mex., sanatorium and employees' quarters, construction and equipment).	do.....	7,500
Roads, Indian reservations, 1932-33.	do.....	15,000
Do.....	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1933.	2,000
Indian school buildings, 1932-33 (construction of physical improvements).	Pay of Indian police, 1933.	10,000
Improvements, Fort Hall irrigation project, Idaho, reimbursement, 1932-33.	Supervising mining operations on leased Indian lands, 1933.	9,000
Indian boarding schools, 1933.	Education, Sioux Nation, 1933.	20,000
Conservation of health among Indians, 1933.	Education of natives of Alaska, 1932-33.	40,000
Do.....	Asylum for insane Indians, Canton, S. Dak., 1933.	5,000
Improvements, Fort Hall irrigation project, Idaho, reimbursement, 1932-33.	Support of Indians and administration of Indian property, 1933.	6,000
Indian boarding schools, 1932-33.	do.....	28,900
Do.....	do.....	4,200
Indian schools, support, 1933.	do.....	30,000
Indian schools, Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma, 1933.	do.....	5,000
Roads, Indian reservations, 1932-33.	do.....	21,500
Total.....		241,700
Grand total.....		706,100

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, the statement made by the gentleman from Oklahoma bears out the information to the effect that in these transfers there has been a plain violation of the intent of Congress, when they took from the emergency construction fund \$30,000 and other sums, as

read by the gentleman from Oklahoma, and transferred them to clerical expenses in another bureau which has nothing to do with emergency relief or construction.

I submit that it is a practice that ought to be stopped, and stopped at once, because I know there was not a single Member of Congress who contemplated that this construction fund, this money voted for the relief of unemployment, should be diverted simply because we did the unusual thing, in order to avoid deficiencies, of giving the heads of departments authority to transfer from one fund to another 12 per cent of the amount of the appropriation.

If that matter had been called to our attention when the Post Office and Treasury bill was up, we would have included a provision to prevent it. But I hope if that be necessary—and it certainly ought not to be necessary—the Economy Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, where the Treasury and Post Office bills are now pending, will write into it a provision preventing any further misuse of the funds appropriated by this Congress.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think these transfers have been more prevalent than the gentleman has stated. Twelve per cent of the gross appropriation constitutes an immense sum of money. It seems to me, that in orderly procedure, as a matter of legislation, there ought to be restrictions put in all these appropriation bills or some general restriction prohibiting the use by any department head of any excess of funds except those appropriated by specific appropriation, and if it is necessary for a department in its administration of affairs to expend more, to come back and ask for a deficiency appropriation.

Mr. BYRNS. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have had occasion to give some little examination to this matter. I think it has been grossly abused, and that the Congress itself ought to put strict limitations upon the part of the executive officers who abuse the confidence of Congress.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Alabama. That was one of the reasons which actuated me, and I think my friend from Indiana [Mr. Wood] last year when we expressed our personal disapproval of the provision authorizing the transfer of funds within the departments. But it was agreed on then simply because heavy reductions were being made, and we felt in the interest of economy we ought to try it out for a limited period.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the instances just cited by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Byrns] have demonstrated the very great danger of making it possible to transfer from one fund to another. I know both the gentleman from Tennessee and I have opposed such a transfer ever since I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and the abuse that is now going on demonstrates the necessity of not permitting it, when the emergency that caused it to be granted at this time is past. They are defeating the very purpose of the economy bill, and they are doing it in absolute violation of the intent of Congress.

As stated by the gentleman from Tennessee, when this privilege was granted, this authorization put in the various appropriation bills, it was intended for but one purpose, and that was when they found that they were going to have a surplus appropriated for in one division or bureau, in order to carry out the same purpose in another division where there was a deficiency, it might be transferred in order to carry out the purposes for which the bureau was created. There is no one who has been abusing it but knows it was never intended to be used in the payment of salaries or in keeping on the pay roll those that Congress intended should be released therefrom. It is a bad practice, and unless inquiry is made and close watch is kept Congress

is not able to find out the extent of these abuses. If the testimony before the subcommittee on the Treasury and Post Office bill is truthful, then I am glad to say that up to the time of the presentation of that testimony that practice had not obtained down there; but with the knowledge now, as disclosed in this discussion, that it is being done by at least two departments, it is notice to the others, if we let it go by unchallenged, that they can do it, too, and they will do it, and that thwarts the very purpose for which this privilege has been given. As suggested by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], there should be a limitation put on every one of these bills or a rule brought in making it in order to apply it to all in one measure, so that this abuse can not be continued.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the general criticisms that have been made could not have been made on some other bill than the Interior Department appropriation bill. The Interior Department bill was the only bill, as Members will recall, that last year was not sent to conference. The Interior Department bill passed this House, went over to the Senate, was there reported by the committee of the Senate to the Senate, and then upon the floor of the Senate was subjected to an arbitrary reduction of 10 per cent. Then the bill as it passed the Senate was concurred in by the House, without having been sent to conference at all. Generally speaking, I think that these provisions transferring 12 per cent or any other per cent under the head of interchangeable funds is a mistaken policy. Yet, in view of what occurred last year, I was one of those who went before the Economy Committee and urged that for the time being and to meet the emergency we should carry that provision into the bill.

But we did not limit the department to the use of money transferred. For instance, there are activities where personnel means practically everything. Of course, a bureau or a department ought not to expend money for a purpose not authorized; but if Congress authorizes transfers, it may be quite necessary to apply part of the money transferred to payment of existing personnel in carrying forward a project fully within the general plan of the Congress. The department within the limited range of 12 per cent was called upon to choose the most urgent needs.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BLAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 13710, the Interior Department appropriation bill, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. DE PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DE PRIEST. I am.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DE PRIEST moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that committee to report the same back forthwith with the recommendation that the amendment relating to Howard University be agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion, that it is indefinite and uncertain and does not conform to the rules of the House.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing indefinite about that motion.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The House is entitled to be acquainted with the amount involved, at least.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the amendment previously offered is now in the office of the reporters of debates. The gentleman from Illinois will have to reduce his motion to writing, as required by the rules of the House.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 500. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to sell obsolete and surplus clothing at a nominal price to the needy.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. JOHNSON and Mr. FLETCHER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Department of Commerce.

LAWS AND REGULATIONS RELATING TO RELIEF OF VETERANS

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Joint Resolution 527

Resolved, etc., That the time within which the joint committee to investigate the operation of the laws and regulations relating to the relief of veterans, created by section 701 of the legislative appropriation act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, approved June 30, 1932, shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives is hereby extended to and including the 3d of March, 1933.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, as I understood the reading of the resolution it simply extends the time for the report. It does not call for any appropriation or anything else except an extension of time. Is that correct?

Mr. McDUFFIE. That is correct. The committee did not ask and has not asked, and we hope it will not be called upon to ask for any appropriation at the hands of Congress to carry on its work.

Mr. SNELL. If the gentleman has not asked for any appropriation but is simply asking for an extension of time, I think it ought to be given to him.

Mr. McDUFFIE. May I say to the Members that this committee was not able to function in the interim, after the adjournment of Congress, for various reasons.

Mr. SNELL. There was other business before the country. [Laughter.]

Mr. McDUFFIE. We endeavored to organize as soon as possible. The gentleman will recognize it is a large subject, broad in scope, to investigate all laws dealing with relief for all veterans. The committee is trying to make of the work an intelligent report. It can not do it within the limited time allowed, and we hope to be able to make a report by February 1, but in order to have time and to avoid the necessity of coming back and asking for further time to carry out the provisions of the resolution properly, we are

asking now to be permitted to make the report not later than the 3d of March.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KVALE. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. McDuffie] can assure the House that there is no possibility of having the report brought in on March 3 as a basis for legislation, which would then be considered under suspension of the rules?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Any report by the committee would doubtless be referred to a standing committee of the House, and the committee's hope is that the new Congress will take up this subject and deal with it immediately.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the House joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DE PRIEST moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that committee to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: "On page 98, line 12, after the figures '\$220,000,' add the following: 'for construction and completion of a heat, light, and power plant at Howard University, \$460,000, to be immediately available.'"

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DE PRIEST) there were—ayes 34, noes 73.

Mr. DE PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 110, nays 95, not voting 224, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

YEAS—110

Adkins	Eaton, Colo.	Knutson	Sinclair
Andresen	Englebright	Kurtz	Snell
Arentz	Finley	Kvale	Snow
Bachmann	Fish	Lambertson	Stalker
Bacon	Foss	Lankford, Va.	Stewart
Black	French	Leavitt	Strong, Kans.
Bolton	Garber	Loneragan	Stull
Britten	Gilchrist	Lovette	Summers, Wash.
Burtness	Goss	Luce	Sutphin
Cable	Guyer	McClintock, Ohio	Sweeney
Campbell, Iowa	Hadley	McCormack	Swick
Carter, Calif.	Hall, N. Dak.	Magrady	Swing
Carter, Wyo.	Hancock, N. Y.	Mapes	Taber
Christgau	Haugen	Michener	Taylor, Tenn.
Clarke, N. Y.	Hawley	Millard	Temple
Colton	Hoch	Moore, Ohio	Thatcher
Condon	Hollister	Mouser	Tinkham
Cooper, Ohio	Holmes	Murphy	Wason
Crowther	Hope	Nelson, Me.	Watson
Culkin	Houston, Del.	Parker, N. Y.	Weeks
Curry	Hull, Morton D.	Person	Welch
Darrow	Hull, William E.	Pettengill	White
Davis, Pa.	James	Pittenger	Wigglesworth
Delaney	Jenkins	Ransley	Williamson
De Priest	Kahn	Robinson	Woodruff
Dieterich	Keller	Rogers, Mass.	Yates
Dowell	Kelly, Pa.	Schneider	
Dyer	Ketcham	Shreve	

NAYS—95

Allgood	Castellow	Ellzey	Johnson, Mo.
Almon	Chavez	Fernandez	Johnson, Okla.
Arnold	Cochran, Mo.	Flesinger	Johnson, Tex.
Ayres	Collier	Fulmer	Jones
Bankhead	Collins	Gasque	Kemp
Barton	Cooper, Tenn.	Glover	Kunz
Bland	Cross	Green	Lambeth
Blanton	Crowe	Gregory	Lamneck
Boehne	Davis, Tenn.	Hare	Lanham
Boileau	DeRouen	Hastings	Lankford, Ga.
Boland	Dickinson	Hill, Ala.	Lozier
Briggs	Dies	Hill, Wash.	McClintic, Okla.
Buchanan	Disney	Huddleston	McDuffie
Byrns	Doughton	Jacobsen	McReynolds
Carden	Doxey	Jeffers	McSwain

Mansfield
Milligan
Mitchell
Montague
Moore, Ky.
Morehead
Norton, Nebr.
Oliver, Ala.
Parker, Ga.

Parks
Parsons
Patterson
Polk
Pratt, Harcourt J.
Rainey
Rayburn
Reilly
Romjue

Sanders, Tex.
Sandlin
Shallenberger
Spence
Stevenson
Summers, Tex.
Swank
Tarver
Taylor, Colo.

Thomason
Timberlake
West
Whittington
Williams, Mo.
Williams, Tex.
Wilson
Woodrum

NOT VOTING—223

Abernethy
Aldrich
Allen
Amie
Andrew, Mass.
Andrews, N. Y.
Auf der Heide
Bacharach
Baldrige
Barbour
Beam
Beck
Beedy
Biddle
Bloom
Bohn
Bowman
Boylan
Brand, Ga.
Brand, Ohio
Browning
Brumm
Brunner
Buckbee
Bulwinkle
Burch
Burdick
Busby
Butler
Campbell, Pa.
Canfield
Cannon
Carley

Cartwright
Cary
Cavichia
Celler
Chapman
Chase
Chindblom
Chilperfield
Christopherson
Clague
Clancy
Clark, N. C.
Cochran, Pa.
Cole, Iowa
Cole, Md.
Connery
Connolly
Cooke
Corning
Cox
Coyle
Crall
Crosier

Crump
Cullen
Davenport
Dickstein
Dominick
Douglas, Ariz.
Douglass, Mass.
Doutrich
Drane
Drewry
Driver
Eaton, N. J.
Erk
Eslick
Estep
Evans, Calif.
Evans, Mont.
Fishburne
Fitzpatrick
Flannagan
Flood
Frear
Free
Freeman
Fulbright
Fuller
Gambrell
Gavagan
Gibson
Gifford
Gilbert
Gillen
Golder

Goldsborough
Goodwin
Granfield
Greenwood
Griffin
Griswold
Haines
Hall, Ill.
Hall, Miss.
Hancock, N. C.
Hardy
Harlan
Hart
Hartley
Hess
Hogg, Ind.
Hogg, W. Va.
Holaday
Hooper
Hopkins
Hornor
Horr
Howard

Igoe
Johnson, Ill.
Johnson, S. Dak.
Johnson, Wash.
Kading
Kelly, Ill.
Kendall
Kennedy, Md.
Kennedy, N. Y.
Kerr
Kinzer
Kleberg
Kniffin
Kopp
LaGuardia
Larrabee
Larsen
Lea
Lehlbach
Lewis
Lichtenwainer
Lindsay
Loofbourov
Ludlow
McFadden
McGugin
McKeown
McLeod
McMillan
Maas
Major
Maloney
Manlove
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Oreg.
May
Mead
Miller
Mobley
Montet
Nelson, Mo.
Nelson, Wis.
Niedringhaus
Nolan
Norton, N. J.
O'Connor
Oliver, N. Y.
Overton
Owen
Palmsano
Partridge
Patman
Peavey
Perkins
Pou
Prall

Pratt, Ruth
Purnell
Ragon
Ramseyer
Ramspeck
Rankin
Reed, N. Y.
Reid, Ill.
Rich
Rogers, N. H.
Rudd
Sabath
Sanders, N. Y.
Schafer
Schuetz
Seger
Seiberling
Selvig
Shannon
Shott
Simmons
Sirovich
Smith, Idaho
Smith, Va.
Smith, W. Va.
Somers, N. Y.
Sparks
Stafford
Steagall
Stokes
Strong, Pa.
Sullivan, N. Y.
Sullivan, Pa.
Swanson
Thurston
Tierney
Treadway
Turpin
Underhill
Underwood
Vinson, Ga.
Vinson, Ky.
Warren
Weaver
Whitley
Wingo
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolfenden
Wolverton
Wood, Ga.
Wood, Ind.
Wright
Wyant
Yon

The Clerk announced the following pairs:
On this vote:

Mr. Hess (for) with Mr. Warren (against).
Mr. Connolly (for) with Mr. Kniffin (against).
Mr. Celler (for) with Mr. Miller (against).
Mr. Beck (for) with Mr. Wingo (against).
Mr. Golder (for) with Mr. Fuller (against).
Mr. Wolfenden (for) with Mr. Browning (against).
Mr. Doutrich (for) with Mr. Eslick (against).
Mr. Stokes (for) with Mr. Ragan (against).
Mr. Gavagan (for) with Mr. Driver (against).
Mr. Martin of Massachusetts (for) with Mr. Kleberg (against).
Mr. Bloom (for) with Mr. Mobley (against).
Mr. Kinzer (for) with Mr. Larsen (against).
Mr. Cullen (for) with Mr. Gilbert (against).
Mr. McLeod (for) with Mr. Drane (against).
Mr. Granfield (for) with Mr. Cartwright (against).
Mr. Connery (for) with Mr. McKeown (against).
Mr. Buckbee (for) with Mr. Flannagan (against).
Mr. Fitzpatrick (for) with Mr. Vinson of Georgia (against).
Mr. Chindblom (for) with Mr. Bulwinkle (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Greenwood with Mr. Biddle.
Mr. Lindsay with Mr. Evans of California.
Mr. Crosser with Mr. Manlove.
Mr. Gamble with Mr. Frear.
Mrs. Norton of New Jersey with Mr. Barbour.
Mr. Douglas of Arizona with Mr. Bowman.
Mr. Beam with Mr. Free.
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Hopkins.
Mr. Harlan with Mr. McGugin.
Mr. Carley with Mr. Holaday.
Mr. Rankin with Mr. Cavichia.
Mr. Burch with Mr. Kopp.
Mr. Overton with Mr. Campbell of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Kennedy of New York with Mr. Coyle.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. Freeman.
 Mr. Boylan with Mr. Horr.
 Mr. Rudd with Mr. Johnson of Washington.
 Mr. Clark or North Carolina with Mr. Kendall.
 Mr. Douglass of Massachusetts with Mr. Davenport.
 Mr. Haines with Lehlbach.
 Mr. Steagall with Mr. Niedringhaus.
 Mr. Brunner with Mrs. Pratt.
 Mr. Underwood with Mr. Reed of New York.
 Mr. Mead with Mr. Whitley.
 Mr. Lewis with Mr. Thurston.
 Mr. Wood of Georgia with Mr. Underhill.
 Mr. Tierney with Mr. Chipfield.
 Mr. Busby with Mr. Turpin.
 Mr. Cox with Mr. Hooper.
 Mr. Auf der Heide with Mr. Clague.
 Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Wolverton.
 Mr. Evans of Montana with Mr. Treadway.
 Mr. Kennedy of Maryland with Mr. Wyant.
 Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Sparks.
 Mr. Wright with Mr. Perkins.
 Mr. Lea with Mr. Selvig.
 Mr. Montet with Mr. LaGuardia.
 Mr. Pou with Mr. Nelson of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Fishburn with Mr. Simmons.
 Mr. Vinson of Kentucky with Mr. Hogg of West Virginia.
 Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Cochran of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Clancy.
 Mr. Weaver with Mr. Looftbourrow.
 Mr. Prall with Mr. Smith of Idaho.
 Mr. Palmisano with Mr. Ramseyer.
 Mr. Ramspeck with Mr. Nolan.
 Mr. Yon with Mr. Schafer.
 Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Wolcott.
 Mr. Brand of Georgia with Mr. Strong of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Cannon with Mr. Chase.
 Mr. Larrabee with Mr. Amle.
 Mr. Howard with Mr. Burdick.
 Mr. Gillen with Mr. Allen.
 Mr. Canfield with Mr. Cooke.
 Mr. Griswold with Mr. Aldrich.
 Mr. Fulbright with Mr. Hardy.
 Mr. Drewry with Mr. Estep.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, may we have the vote announced?

The SPEAKER. It has developed there is not a quorum present.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, what was the vote?

The SPEAKER. It is not necessary to give that out, so the Parliamentarian informs the Chair, but the Chair may announce that so far the vote is—yeas 110, nays 95. There is not a quorum present.

The gentleman from Illinois moves that the House do now adjourn.

The Chair puts the question of seconding the motion. Those seconding the motion of the gentleman from Illinois that the House do now adjourn will rise. [After counting.] Those opposed to seconding the motion will now rise.

The question being taken, the House divided; and there were—ayes 140, noes 21.

So a second was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to adjourn.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, December 23, 1932, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Friday, December 23, 1932, as reported to the floor leader:

EXPENDITURES

(10.30 a. m.)

Continue hearings on President's message relative to consolidation of governmental activities.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

835. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report of activities and expenditures for November, 1932, together with a statement of loans authorized during that month, showing the name, amount, and rate of

interest in each case (H. Doc. No. 515), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BUCHANAN: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 13872. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1807). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KNUTSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 11810. A bill providing for payment of \$25 to each enrolled Chippewa Indian of Minnesota from the funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1808). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILSON: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 13523. A bill in reference to land in the Bonnet Carre floodway area; without amendment (Rept. No. 1809). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13259) for the relief of Edward F. Smith, and the same was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SHANNON: A bill (H. R. 13871) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: A bill (H. R. 13872) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 13873) to amend section 751 of the revenue act of 1932; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 13874) to save the United States Government the sum of approximately \$150,000,000 annually in interest charges by the issuance of low-interest rate tax-exempt bonds to retire the \$6,286,099,450 4¼ per cent Liberty bonds callable October 15, 1933; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIROVICH: A bill (H. R. 13875) to amend an act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920, and acts in amendment thereof, approved May 29, 1930; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 13876) to provide for the acceptance of farm-land securities as the basis for the issuance of currency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 13877) to regulate service of contest notices in all cases affecting mining locations or claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 13878) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act, as amended by the emergency relief and construction act of 1932, by adding thereto a new section providing for direct loans to banks, trust companies, insurance companies, and building and loan associations, for the specific purpose of preventing foreclosures on homes and farms; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 13879) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell certain prop-

erty in St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 13880) to authorize the adjustment of a part of the western boundary line of the Plattsburg Barracks Military Reservation, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. OWEN: A bill (H. R. 13881) to authorize the Secretary of War, on behalf of the War Department, to make, execute, and deliver a deed to Fort Marion and all of the Fort Marion Reservation, in the city of St. Augustine, Fla., to the city of St. Augustine, a municipal corporation under the laws of Florida, for exhibition and park purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McLEOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 524) requesting the President of the United States to call a conference of the governors of the several States and the mayors of the various cities for the purpose of discussing ways and means of declaring a moratorium on sales of homes and farms by States and municipalities because of tax delinquency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 525) authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Brig. Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LEA: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 526) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to sell surplus coal at nominal prices for distribution to the needy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 13882) for the relief of Michael Anderson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 13883) for the relief of Mrs. H. H. Brugmann; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GASQUE: A bill (H. R. 13884) granting a pension to Lillian T. Skinner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUYER: A bill (H. R. 13885) granting an increase of pension to Averill A. Jury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 13886) granting a pension to Anna DeBussey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13887) granting a pension to Samuel Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13888) granting a pension to Ella Beagle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13889) granting a pension to Austin S. Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13890) for the relief of William McMurray; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13891) for the relief of Robert Moyer; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13892) granting an increase of pension to Beuna J. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13893) granting an increase of pension to Lucy A. Cartmell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13894) granting an increase of pension to Clarissa J. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13895) granting an increase of pension to Nannie Queen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13896) granting a pension to J. E. Barrows; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13897) for the relief of Garfield Maynard; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13898) granting a pension to Stella B. Holstein; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13899) granting a pension to Victoria Boalman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 13900) granting a pension to Mary Ware; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 13901) granting an increase of pension to Delilah J. Chapman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H. R. 13902) for the relief of Charles F. Hult; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13903) for the relief of Walter E. Patten; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13904) for the relief of Alice O'Brien; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13905) for the relief of Charles McCarran; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13906) for the relief of Albert Edward Vincent; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHANNON: A bill (H. R. 13907) granting a pension to Hattie M. Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STOKES: A bill (H. R. 13908) granting a pension to Charles S. Benson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TARVER: A bill (H. R. 13909) for the relief of James Harold Hunter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH: A bill (H. R. 13910) for the relief of Charles T. Moll; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

9178. By Mr. BACHMANN: Petition of C. J. Snider and other citizens of Monongah, W. Va., urging the passage of the stop-alien-representation amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out the 6,280,000 aliens in this country and count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9179. Also, petition of A. H. Billingsley and other citizens of Fairview and Marion County, W. Va., urging the passage of the stop-alien-representation amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out the 6,280,000 aliens in this country and count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9180. By Mr. BOYLAN: Letter from the National Council of Business Mail Users, New York City, opposing increased rate in postage, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9181. Also, letter from the National Federation of Federal Employees, Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing further reduction in Federal employees' salaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9182. By Mr. BUCKBEE: Petition of Mrs. Bert Ashton and 56 citizens of Morris, Ill., asking the House to vote favorably on the Sparks-Capper alien representation amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9183. By Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Oil City, Pa., urging the passage of the stop-alien-representation amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out the 6,280,000 aliens in this country, and count only American citizens, when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9184. By Mr. CONDON: Petition of Manel Davis and 35 other citizens of Rhode Island, protesting against any repeal or modification of existing legislation beneficial to Spanish War veterans, their widows, or dependents; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

9185. Also, petition of Charles J. Maguire and 83 other citizens of Rhode Island, protesting against any repeal or modification of existing legislation beneficial to Spanish War veterans, their widows, or dependents; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

9186. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of residents of Amsterdam, N. Y., urging passage of the stop-alien-representation amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9187. Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, Local No. 45, of Deferiet, N. Y., asking Congress for immediate tariff protection of the pulp and paper industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9188. By Mr. DOWELL: Petition of citizens of the towns of Hartford, Carlisle, and Swan, Iowa, protesting against the counting of aliens for representation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9189. Also, petition of citizens of the towns of Indianola, Hartford, Carlisle, and Swan, Iowa, protesting against the counting of aliens for representation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9190. By Mr. ESTEP: Memorial of the First United Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against repeal of the eighteenth amendment or modification of the national prohibition act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9191. By Mr. FOSS: Petition of Walter A. Lane and 11 other residents of Southbridge, Mass., urging the passage of the stop-alien representation amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9192. By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: Petition of 25 members of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Rising Sun, Md., favoring stop-alien representation amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9193. By Mr. HILL of Washington: Petition of Women's Home Missionary Society of St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church, of Spokane, Wash., asking for Government regulation and censorship of the motion-picture industry, and urging the passage of Senate bill 1079 and Senate Resolution 170; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9194. By Mr. HOGG of West Virginia: Petition of Pittsburgh Central Labor Union, protesting against a continuance of the furlough provision in the economy law beyond the present fiscal year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9195. Also, petition of citizens of Tyler County, W. Va., opposing the legalizing of beer and the repeal of the eighteenth amendment or modification of the Volstead Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9196. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of National Association of Post Office Carriers, Local No. 45, Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against further reductions in salaries of postal clerks and letter carriers; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

9197. Also, petition of Farmers Covenant of Blue Earth County, Minn., urging that (1) all foreclosures be stopped during the depression; (2) that a 2-year moratorium be granted; (3) that lower rates of interest be arranged; (4) that a pure fabrics law be enacted by Congress; (5) that a flat rate of railroad freight be granted on all perishable farm products; (6) that a world conference on silver be called to relieve the money stringency by giving us more primary money; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

9198. Also, petition of Central Labor Union, Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against cancellation of foreign debts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9199. Also, petition of Farmers Union of Pipestone County, Minn., urging enactment of the Swank-Thomas bill, and (2) that Congress grant a moratorium on all feed and seed loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9200. Also, petition of Farmers Union of Pipestone County, Minn., urging a moratorium on all farm mortgages; (2) that the farmers be refinanced at as low a rate of interest as given foreign countries; (3) that the Federal reserve bank issue new currency and place it in circulation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

9201. Also, petition of 27 residents of Evansville, Minn., urging enactment of the stop-alien-representation amendment; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

9202. Also, petition of Anderson Miller Post, No. 163, American Legion, Willow River, Minn., urging immediate

payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9203. Also, petition of Women's Home Missionary Society of Montevideo, Minn., urging enactment of bill 1079 on the Senate Calendar and Senate Resolution 170; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9204. By Mr. LAMBETH: Petition of the Women's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Randleman, N. C., requesting Congress to enact a law which will establish a Federal motion-picture commission, and urging the passage of bill 1079 on the Senate Calendar and Senate Resolution 170; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9205. By Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia: Petition of Franklin (Va.) Chapter of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, expressing disapproval of repeal of the eighteenth amendment and opposing modification of the Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9206. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Mailgraph Co., New York City, urging the reduction of first-class postage to the 2-cent letter rate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9207. Also, petition of Naval Militia of the State of New York, urging appropriations for their proper maintenance; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9208. By Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS: Petition of 15 names sent in by the St. Louis Woman's Christian Temperance Union, protesting against the passage of any measures providing for the manufacture of beer, for the nullification of the Constitution, or against any proposal to repeal the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9209. By Mr. PERSON: Petition of J. C. Gibson and 83 other residents of Lansing, Mich., urging the passage of the stop-alien-representation amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out the 6,280,000 aliens in this country, and count only American citizens, when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9210. By Mr. ROBINSON: Petition signed by Rev. C. W. Cleveland, pastor of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Geneva, Iowa, and about 50 other citizens of Geneva, Iowa, protesting against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment and the beer bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9211. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of the State of New York, headquarters Naval Militia, office of the commanding officer, opposing reduction in drills and training, and favoring \$600,000 be added to the Naval Reserve item of the naval appropriation bill, with the proviso that the seagoing units of the Fleet Naval Reserve be allowed 48 drills and 15 days' training for the year; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9212. Also, petition of Marine Corps League (New York), Detachment No. 1, Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing any reduction of the personnel of the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9213. Also, petition of Mailgraph Co., of New York City, favoring the reduction of first-class postage to the 2-cent rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9214. By Mr. SPARKS: Petition of citizens of Barclay and Osage City, Kans., submitted by Edna Wilson and Mrs. H. W. Miller and signed by 42 others, opposing any measure permitting the sale of beer or wine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9215. Also, resolution of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Phillipsburg and Spring Creek, Kans., submitted by Jessie C. Taubion and Phebe Moore, respective presidents of the above-named organizations, protesting against the annulment or modification of the Volstead Act or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; and petition of the Ellis County Woman's Christian Temperance Union and majority of the members of the Protestant churches of Ellis County, Kans., submitted by D. O. Hemphill, committee chairman, protesting against any alteration in the eighteenth amendment or the Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.